

Princeton University Library



32101 076199213



TRANSACTIONS
AND
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
AMERICAN
PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1920
VOLUME LI

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
ADELBERT COLLEGE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LI

TRANSACTIONS

- | | |
|---|-----|
| I. Thermopylae and Artemisium | 5 |
| WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE | |
| II. The Alleged Conflict of the Accents in Latin Verse . . | 19 |
| ROLAND G. KENT | |
| III. Prorsus | 30 |
| JOHN C. ROLFE | |
| IV. The Tauric Maiden and Allied Cults | 40 |
| CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING | |
| V. Bellerophon's Tablet and the Homeric Question in the
Light of Oriental Research | 56 |
| NATHANIEL SCHMIDT | |
| VI. Prudentius and Christian Humanism | 71 |
| EDWARD KENNARD RAND | |
| VII. Gemistus Pletho as a Moral Philosopher | 84 |
| JOHN WILSON TAYLOR | |
| VIII. Spontaneous Generation and Kindred Notions in An-
tiquity | 101 |
| EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY | |
| IX. The Worship of Augustus in Italy during his Lifetime . | 116 |
| LILY ROSS TAYLOR | |
| X. The Exposure of Infants at Athens | 134 |
| LA RUE VAN HOOK | |
| XI. The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of
his Metrical Art | 146 |
| ROBERT S. RADFORD | |
| XII. The 'Αρχίλοχοι of Cratinus and Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος . | 172 |
| ROLLIN H. TANNER | |

2.51 1594
1920

477863

PROCEEDINGS

I.	Programme of the Fifty-second Annual Meeting, Baltimore, 1920	i
II.	Minutes	v
III.	Abstracts	xiii
	1. Note on II 297-302	xiii
	SAMUEL E. BASSETT	
	2. <i>Acharnians</i> , 803	xiii
	H. LAMAR CROSBY	
	3. The Roman Poet Laureate	xiv
	KARL P. HARRINGTON	
	4. Homer, Vergil, and Milton in their Use of Images from Nature	xv
	ARTHUR L. KEITH	
	5. Some Random Notes on Horace	xvi
	CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW	
	6. The Revival of Latin as an International Language .	xvii
	L. J. PAETOW	
	7. The Idea of Law in Greek Poetry	xvii
	HENRY S. SCRIBNER	
	8. The Amulet in Roman Curative Medicine	xviii
	EUGENE TAVENNER	
I.	Programme of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	xx
II.	Minutes	xxii
III.	Abstracts	
	1. Montenegro under the Romans, and the Question of Diocletian's Birthplace	xxv
	H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH	
	2. <i>Partes Secanto</i> in the XII Tables	xxv
	MAX RADIN	
	3. The Literary Analysis of the Book of Acts	xxvi
	WILLIAM J. WILSON	

Contents

3

Index to articles and abstracts	xxviii
Bibliographical Record for the year 1920	xxxix
Officers of the Association	xlii
Officers of the Association of the Pacific Coast	xlii
Members, List of	xliii
Constitution	lxv
Committees and Business Matters	lxvii
Publications of the Association	lxix

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1920

I. — *Thermopylae and Artemisium*

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

ABOUT these two battles or series of battles Mr. G. B. Grundy, in his book *The Great Persian War* (1901), makes the following statements. "The tale of Thermopylae," he says, "is one of the strangest in the history of the world." "It is not merely that some of the details of that most dramatic story are difficult to understand: the motive of the main plot of the tragedy is obscure." This on page 273. On page 340 he says: "In Herodotus' story of the great war the tale of Artemisium is perhaps the least satisfactory of all the detailed accounts of the various acts of the drama. It is not merely complicated by a chronological error of considerable magnitude, the effect of which is to render the most important part of the story, as it stands, incredible; but it is very seriously distorted, from a historical point of view, by the addition of material of a more than doubtful character, inserted with intent to heighten the effect of the services of Athens at this critical time." These statements are true. The chronological error in Herodotus' account, however, is not the one which Mr. Grundy believes he has discovered, but a far more important one. If this error is corrected, all the serious difficulties in Herodotus' narrative disappear; but

then the prevalent opinion must be revised as to the judgment and strategy of both the Persians and the Greeks.

For our knowledge of these battles we are practically dependent upon Herodotus alone. The divergence of Diodorus from Herodotus does not show that the former had any other ultimate source; with insignificant exceptions there is no statement in Diodorus or any ancient author on this subject which differs from the narrative of Herodotus in any other way than the statements of Professor Bury, Mr. Grundy, or any modern writer, whose account is based frankly on that of Herodotus, but is modified by the individual writer in accordance with his own judgment, in view of the topography of the places involved, and of the probabilities of the situations. Yet the account of Herodotus is sufficient of itself to give a true understanding of these most important battles.

The movements of the Persian army and fleet for the three weeks from the departure of the former from Therme are given by Herodotus in such detail that it is possible to calculate, with a high degree of probability, the movements of each force day by day, at least for the last ten days of this period. But the account of each is given separately, and the two series of events are not synchronized in the narrative except at the beginning, at the point when the army entered Malis, and at the end. Therme, later called Thessalonica and now Saloniki, in Macedonia, at the head of the Thermaic Gulf, was the last Persian base before the invasion of Greek territory. Counting the day on which the army left this base as day 1, Herodotus apparently believed that the army entered Malis on day 14 (VII, 196),¹ remained practically inactive there for four days, namely the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th (*ib.* 210), fought its first battle in the pass of Thermopylae on day 18 (*ib.*), its second on day 19 (VII, 212), and its third and last battle on day 20 (*ib.* 223). The Persian fleet left Therme on day 12, sailed all day and toward evening

¹ So Bury, Grundy, and apparently Busolt and Eduard Meyer. Obst believes that the army arrived in Malis on the 13th day; Macan, on the 12th.

arrived on the coast of Magnesia between Casthanaea and Cape Sepias, a distance of about 120 miles (*ib.* 183). On day 13 the storm began at daybreak (*ib.* 188), and lasted until day 16 (*ib.* 191). On day 16 the fleet sailed from the Magnesian coast and in the afternoon arrived at Aphetæ, a place near or within the entrance to the Bay of Pagasæ, and distant twenty-five or thirty miles from Cape Sepias (*ib.* 193 and 196; VIII, 6); on the way fifteen belated Persian ships were captured by the Greeks (VII, 194 and 195). If the naval battles were fought on the same days as the land battles, these must have occurred on days 18, 19, and 20 respectively.

In this relative chronology most scholars are agreed; so, for example, Hauvette,² Busolt,³ Grundy,⁴ Eduard Meyer,⁵ and apparently Beloch.⁶ Bury⁷ and Macan,⁸ however, believe that the battles were on the 16th, 17th, and 18th days respectively, while Obst⁹ holds that the naval battles were on these days, but that there were only two battles in the pass, and these on the 17th and 18th days. The chief difficulties in reconciling the conflicting statements of Herodotus arise in connection with the movements of the Persian fleet from the 16th day onward. All scholars heretofore have united in accepting the statement that the three battles by sea occurred on the same days as the battles by land, and have endeavored to emend or explain the statements which conflict with this. For example, Dr. Macan says, on page 265: "Some readjustments in the apparent scheme are necessary in order to rationalize the story"; on page 272: "The

² Amédée Hauvette, *Hérodote, historien des guerres médiques* (Paris, 1894), 372 ff.

³ Georg Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, II² (1895), 678-688, especially 681 n. 3.

⁴ G. B. Grundy, *The Great Persian War* (1901), 342 f.

⁵ Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, III (1901), 378-383.

⁶ *Griechische Geschichte*, I (1893), 371-373; II, I² (1914), 43-46.

⁷ J. B. Bury, "The Campaign of Artemisium and Thermopylae," *Annual of the British School at Athens*, II (1895-6), 83-104.

⁸ R. W. Macan, *Herodotus, the Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Books*, II (1908), 260-286.

⁹ Ernst Obst, "Der Feldzug des Xerxes," *Klio*, Beiheft XII (1913).

given synchronisms must be taken as the point of departure for reconstructing the diaries throughout"; on page 273: "Let the fixed point of departure be the recorded fact that there were three days' fighting by land, and three days' fighting at sea, the *triduum* of each being one and identical." On the other hand I believe that this statement of Herodotus is the only important item in his account which is false.

In Book VIII, chapters 6 and 7, Herodotus says: "When the Barbarians arrived at Aphetae in the afternoon (*περὶ δείλῃν πρωίην γινομένην*), having learned before this that a few Greek ships were stationed at Artemisium and then seeing these themselves, they were eager to attack, in the hope of taking them. To sail directly against them, however, did not seem to them advisable yet, lest the Greeks, seeing them approaching, might turn to flight and darkness might rescue them as they fled. Of course, the Greeks would flee, they thought; but they wanted not even a torch-bearer to escape, as they put it. So they adopted the following plan. Choosing two hundred from the whole fleet they sent these around outside of Sciathus, so that they would not be seen by the enemy as they sailed around Euboea, past Caphareus and Geraestus, into the Euripus; they did this that they might take the enemy in the rear, when these two hundred ships arrived there and closed the passage behind the Greeks, while they themselves attacked in front. With this purpose they sent off the swiftest of the ships, and did not have it in mind to attack the Greeks on that day, or before they received the signal from those who were sailing around that they had arrived. They sent these around, but the rest of the ships they reviewed at Aphetae."

The first impression made by this passage is that the two hundred ships were sent off after all had arrived at Aphetae. Mr. Grundy understands it so, and sees herein a chronological error. According to Mr. Grundy (p. 330), "Herodotus does not say, but he certainly implies, that this flying squadron was despatched on the very day of the arrival at Aphetae."

“It is not necessary to insist,” Mr. Grundy says, “that this was, under the circumstances, hardly possible. The fleet had been terribly knocked about by the storm. The storm itself had only ceased that very morning. There had been no time to refit before leaving for Aphetæ; and the fleet had only reached that anchorage early in the afternoon of that 16th day. These two hundred vessels, moreover, were evidently despatched by daylight.” This last statement is, of course, a deduction from the statement of Herodotus that the two hundred ships were sent outside of Sciathus in order that they might not be *seen* by the enemy. But Herodotus does not tell us either when these boats were sent off, or where they were sent from. In his narrative the arrival at Aphetæ merely determines the time at which the Persian fleet wished to attack but refrained from doing so. The account of the detached squadron does not follow immediately. There intervenes a brief discussion of the reason for the delay: the Persians, believing themselves superior to the Greeks, wished to capture the whole Greek fleet. That was why they sent the two hundred boats around Euboea, and why they did not attack at once when they arrived at Aphetæ. Undoubtedly Herodotus could have expressed himself more precisely, if he really understood the sequence of events and regarded the exact sequence as important. But as they stand his words admit the possibility that the squadron was sent around Sciathus and Euboea from Cape Sepias, at the time when the rest of the fleet started for Aphetæ.¹⁰ A glance at the map will show that this is the only reasonable interpretation of the passage. It is evident that the Greek fleet was stationed not at Cape Artemisium, which is on the extreme northeastern corner of Euboea, but some ten or fifteen miles farther west, at the beginning of the narrows near Histiaea and beyond the entrance to the Bay of Pagasæ. Otherwise the Persian fleet could not have reached Aphetæ

¹⁰ Or immediately on the arrival of the fleet off the Magnesian coast, as Bury, Munro, and Macan hold.

without a battle. To have sailed these two hundred ships in to Aphetae and then to have sent them out alone, on a secret mission, in full view of the Greek fleet, would have been a manifest absurdity. Moreover, if these boats had been sent from Aphetae, there would have been no reason for sending them outside of Sciathus. This island lies almost opposite Cape Sepias and north of the passage between Magnesia and Euboea. Boats sailing from Aphetae would have been twenty or twenty-five miles from the Greek fleet before they reached Sciathus at all, and would have been completely out of sight. Even if Greek watchmen posted on Cape Artemisium had seen the squadron turn northward when it reached the Aegean, and had so reported to the Greek commanders, this information would not have allayed their suspicions. It might have been supposed that these boats intended first to join others still left on the Magnesian coast. The Greeks suspected that the Persians intended to surround the Greek fleet by sending a force around Euboea to take them in the rear, for fifty-three Greek warships had been left near Chalcis as a rear guard to prevent this very attempt. The detachment of so large a squadron from the Persian fleet, whatever its course at first, would have confirmed the suspicions of the Greeks, and this was precisely what the Persians wished to avoid. On the other hand, if the squadron was sent from Cape Sepias and passed outside of Sciathus, its course would have been wholly out of the sight of the Greeks, and its departure would have been unknown to them. And if on the 16th day the main fleet was in condition to sail to Aphetae, risking an immediate attack by the Greeks, there is no reason to assume that the two hundred vessels were not in condition to make the voyage around Euboea.

There is then no ground in Herodotus for denying that the flying squadron was sent off on the 16th, and that the review of the main Persian fleet took place on the same day, as Herodotus plainly says. Herodotus further tells us in VIII, 8 that during the review a certain Greek named Scyllies,

serving with the Persians, escaped and brought to the Greeks the news that two hundred vessels had been detached from the Persian fleet and sent around Euboea. If the review was held early in the afternoon, and if the Greek commander acted promptly on receipt of the news brought by Scyllies, the first battle between the fleets might have taken place on the same day also. Herodotus says that the attack was made late in the afternoon, perhaps, as Mr. Grundy suggests, in order that the Greeks, if unsuccessful, might escape in the darkness. The news brought by Scyllies would suggest an immediate attack. The Greek fleet was ready for action, as is shown by the capture of fifteen belated Persian vessels on their way to Aphetae, and the Greeks might well expect that so late in the day they would find the Persians unprepared for battle and wearied by their voyage from Magnesia.

Scyllies may have escaped in time for the first battle to take place on the evening of the 16th day. Beloch states flatly that this first battle occurred on the day of the arrival at Aphetae. Mr. Grundy believes that this view is in accordance with the narrative of Herodotus, but considers Herodotus in error at this point. There is perhaps some indirect evidence furnished by Herodotus that the first battle was on the 16th. He says, in VIII, 12 and 13, that in the night after the first battle the same storm which wrecked the flying squadron off the Hollows of Euboea drove in upon the fleet at Aphetae the bodies of those killed and the wreckage of the boats destroyed in the first battle. If the flying squadron left Cape Sepias on the 16th, the storm which wrecked it occurred on the night of the 16th, and the ships whose wrecks were washed in upon the Persian fleet by this storm must have been lost in a battle on the afternoon of the same day. The distance from Cape Sepias to the southern point of Euboea is about the same as the distance from Therme to Cape Sepias. The Persian fleet had made the voyage from Therme to Cape Sepias in a single day, arriving

apparently towards evening (VII, 183). If then this squadron left Cape Sepias somewhat late in the morning, it should have arrived during the night of the same day off the Hollows of Euboea, where Herodotus says it was wrecked.¹¹ According to Herodotus the second naval battle was on the day after the first, the third naval battle on the day after the second, that is, on the third consecutive day. The fifty-three boats of the Greek rear guard joined the main fleet at Artemisium before the second battle. In that case they must have left Chalcis on the morning of the 17th, after receiving news that the Persian squadron had been wrecked the night before. If so, the three naval battles at Artemisium were on the 16th, 17th, and 18th days respectively.

Personally, however, I do not attach much weight to such stories as that about the wreckage washed in at Aphetae. In any case the wreckage may have been from the fifteen Persian ships captured by the Greeks on the way to Aphetae (Hdt. VII, 194 f.). It seems to me more probable that, while Scyllies may have left the Persian fleet during the review, he did not effect his escape until darkness fell. In that case he did not reach the Greeks until the night of the 16th, and the first naval battle was on the 17th day. The second naval battle then was on the 18th. If the fifty-three Greek boats from Chalcis did not join the rest until the 18th day, this may have been due to one of several causes. They may not have learned the loss of the Persian squadron at once. They may have cruised about the south end of Euboea on the 17th day, in order to make sure that the Persian vessels were

¹¹ The passage in Strabo defining the Hollows of Euboea is obviously corrupt, and consequently the location of the Hollows is in dispute. Possibly the term denoted the whole lower or southern third of the island, including both the eastern and western coasts. But certainly that part of the coast which was notoriously dangerous to ancient ships was the east coast, between the promontory Chersonesus and Cape Caphareus, where Ptolemy explicitly places the Hollows, and no other location can be reconciled with the references in Dio Chrysostom, VII, 2, 7, 31, 32, 38, and 55. Nor do I see any good reason for denying that there were two storms, as Professor Bury and others do. However, these matters are not really important in the present discussion.

really lost. Or they may have awaited orders from the commanders at Artemisium, in spite of Herodotus' assertion that the news of the loss of the Persian squadron reached the main fleet at about the same time as the fifty-three boats from Chalcis. In any case Herodotus says these boats arrived at Artemisium on the day of the second naval battle. The third and final battle of the fleets occurred on the day following. Thus the three naval battles at Artemisium took place on the 17th, 18th, and 19th, if not on the 16th, 17th, and 18th days respectively.

But see what consequences follow from this correction of the traditional chronology of these battles! On the 17th day Xerxes was still holding his army inactive at Thermopylae. He knew, from the experience of the Persians at Marathon if in no other way, the danger of a frontal attack in such a place upon Greek hoplites, even though the total Greek force numbered scarcely more than seven thousand. Doubtless there were other roads further to the west; but these were no more practical for Xerxes than they were later for Philip, Brennus, Antigonus, or the others whom Mr. Grundy mentions. It was not necessary, however, for Xerxes to force the pass, if his fleet could defeat the Greek fleet and so land troops behind the defenders of Thermopylae. Therefore he waited for the victory of his fleet which he expected, and which would necessitate the evacuation of the pass. By the night of the 17th, however, he knew that many of his ships had been lost on the Magnesian coast, and that the main fleet, penned in at Aphetae, had already been defeated and somewhat demoralized by the Greeks. If he had spies at Chalcis or elsewhere, and some sort of signal service, he may even have known then that his flying squadron, two hundred of his best warships, had been lost. Thus his original plan, which seemed so sound and safe, had failed, chiefly because of the losses which his fleet had suffered from storms, the violence of which he could not have foreseen. Consequently he was obliged to risk the direct attack upon the

pass on the 18th. On this day the fleet sought to remain inactive while the army fought, evidently believing that if the Greek army was defeated the Greek fleet would retire of its own accord. The Greek fleet, however, reinforced by the fifty-three boats from Chalcis, made a second attack, and destroyed one contingent of the Persian fleet, namely, the Cilicians.¹² It does not seem to have been much of a battle on the sea, but rather a sort of skirmish. The real battle of that day was fought on the land. Here again the Persians were defeated. The result was that Xerxes returned to his original plan, and ordered the entire Persian fleet to attack on the 19th. On this day the armies also fought. The second battle in the pass seems to have been a repetition of the first. Certainly it was unsuccessful and perhaps the attack was not pushed, because its design was chiefly to avoid the appearance of defeat, which would affect unfavorably the morale of the Persian troops. The Persian fleet, however, seems to have been victorious. The Greek fleet was not captured or destroyed; but even so loyal a partisan of the Athenians as Herodotus admits (VIII, 18) that the Greeks suffered severely, especially the Athenians, half of whose ships were damaged, and that they planned to withdraw to the interior of Greece even before they had the news that Leonidas was killed and the pass taken. If so, then they decided to leave Leonidas to his fate, which was made certain by their action, and this could have been only because the Greek fleet was defeated and forced to withdraw from Artemisium. Yet the consensus of opinion among scholars has been that the Greek fleet was not defeated. Just so after

¹² Macan believes that the account of the fifteen Persian ships captured in the first naval battle and that of the thirty Cilician ships destroyed in the second are duplicate accounts of one and the same battle from different sources. J. A. R. Munro, "Some Observations on the Persian Wars," *J. H. S.* xxii (1902), 294-332, thinks that these thirty Cilician ships were the survivors of the flying squadron of two hundred, and that they were destroyed by the fifty-three Athenian boats off the Hollows of Euboea, after the storm had wrecked the others.

the battle of Jutland the Germans claimed that their fleet had defeated the English, because they had inflicted more damage on the English ships than they had suffered, and they proclaimed that their emperor was master of the sea. But the world was not convinced. That fleet was victorious which remained on the site of the battle and searched for the enemy; the German fleet, which fled from the British to its own home base and never appeared again while the war lasted, was defeated though not destroyed. How much more is that true of the Athenian fleet at Artemisium, in view of the fact that it was of the utmost importance to the Greek plan to hold the position in the strait. It is not true that the defeat of the army in the pass would have made it impossible or unnecessary for the fleet to remain at Artemisium, blocking the passage of the Persian fleet if it could. With its rear protected by the danger of the voyage around Euboea, the strait at Artemisium was the best if not the only place for the Greek fleet to fight successfully against the superior numbers of the Persians, for the Greeks could not have counted with certainty on the Persians attacking them again at Salamis. If the Persians had chosen to sail outside of Salamis and coöperate with the army at the Isthmus, the Greeks would have had small chance of success. Doubtless that was what Themistocles feared — if he really sent his famous message to Xerxes — not that the Greeks would refuse to fight. And if the Persian fleet had taken up its station off the Isthmus, the smaller Greek fleet could hardly have won a victory in the open waters of the Saronic Gulf.

The withdrawal of the Greek fleet from Artemisium necessitated the immediate evacuation of the pass of Thermopylae. No attack by Hydarnes and his men marching over the mountain path by night, no cowardice of the Phocians guarding this path, was necessary to render the position of the Greek army untenable, though these events may have occurred. Personally I believe that Leonidas himself ordered the Phocians to withdraw, and that these, coming back from the

mountain and retreating homeward, were seen by the others who did not understand the situation and therefore spread the story of the cowardice of these Phocians in the face of an unexpected attack. Certainly many of those in the pass were ordered by Leonidas to retreat that night, and it was natural that the Phocians should be withdrawn first, in order not to block the road. Leonidas himself and some of the troops were obliged to remain at their post in order to cover the retreat. When two armies are opposing each other on the only practicable road, and are situated within a few hundred yards of each other — just out of bow-shot — as these armies doubtless were, some of the retreating force has to be sacrificed in order that any may escape. And this sacrifice Leonidas and his Spartans, with some others, nobly made.

If this is the true story of the battles of Thermopylae and Artemisium, as I believe it to be, there remains no ground for criticising either the Persian or the Greek plan of campaign. There is no evidence of lack on the part of the Greeks of an appreciation of the magnitude of their danger, of selfish interests on the part of the several states preventing co-operation, of weakness or vacillation on the part of the commanders. Such failings appear only in rumors of what was thought or said in secret councils, or planned but never carried out. For these rumors there is no foundation. The actual events which Herodotus records — events known to all — are the best, and in fact the only, remaining evidences of what was planned and why.

The Greeks could have had no expectation of defeating the Persian army at Thermopylae.¹³ They expected only to delay the Persian army, in the hope that their fleet might defeat the Persians and compel the retirement of the whole force or a complete change in the Persian plan, as they succeeded in doing later at Salamis. Without this fleet the large Persian army could not be supported in Greece. If this army was

¹³ Eduard Meyer alone has emphasized this fact.

sufficiently reduced to support itself on the country, it might then be small enough to be defeated by the Greek land force. We criticise the Greeks for sending so small a force to Thermopylae. They sent troops enough. Xerxes thought so, until his fleet had been defeated, and then he risked an attack which failed. The Greeks at Thermopylae did hold the Persians until the Greek fleet was finally defeated and forced to withdraw. Their fleet was the largest and strongest they could possibly collect. It was their only hope. It seems to have been well handled; but it was defeated in a pitched battle, by superior numbers and through no apparent fault of its own, as many another good fleet, and army, too, for that matter, has been defeated. By its defeat all northern Greece was lost, not by the failure of the little army at the pass of Thermopylae. Fortunately for them, the fleet had another chance, and this time it was victorious. Thus Greece was saved; the events justified completely the Greek plan of campaign.

I do not hope to convince every one by this exposition. The old tradition in which we all were trained has too strong a hold upon us. Some have said and will continue to say: "Herodotus states positively that the battles on land and sea were synchronous, and that the news of Leonidas' death reached the Greek fleet before it withdrew from Artemisium. These are the most definite statements in the whole account. How could Herodotus have imagined such things if they were not true?" To such critics I would say that these statements conflict with the rest of the narrative, which seems to me to make it clear that the last battle on the sea was not later than the 19th day, while the final battle in the pass was not before the 20th. And the origin of the statements in question is not hard to trace. The accounts of the battles given by the soldiers of the army were independent of those given by the sailors of the fleet. Neither party knew precisely what the other was doing at any particular time, and in the absence of a fixed and universal calendar it was

very difficult to compare one date with another. Doubtless each party tried to put the blame for the defeat on the other, especially as most of the navy were Athenians, while all of the army were Peloponnesians or Boeotians, Phocians, and Locrians. Many of the soldiers must have said that the navy was defeated, and deserted its post. Many of the sailors must have said that the army was defeated, and therefore there was no need for the navy to remain. Herodotus naturally accepted the Athenian, which was the sailors' view, and therefore he was compelled to believe that somehow the death of Leonidas must have occurred on the same day as the last battle of the fleets, although this statement conflicted with his own account of the events. As for the statement that the news of Leonidas' death was brought to the council of the commanders of the fleet before they actually ordered a retreat, no one but the commanders themselves knew what messages were brought to their council, or what influenced their decision. Had Herodotus known what the commanders in this war knew or thought, his account of the war and its campaigns would not have been as defective and naïve as it is.

But what is the alternative? That we should believe the heroes of the Persian Wars to have been incompetent and puerile. Mr. Grundy, for example, on page 225, speaking of the invasion of Xerxes in 480, says: "No joint preparation was made, because its necessity was not apprehended," and again, on page 267: "The general design, then, in accordance with which the Greek forces took up their position at Thermopylae and Artemisium was in conception admirable. For one of those mysterious reasons which so often recur in Greek history, it was but half executed." This is something which I, for one, am unwilling to admit.

II. — *The Alleged Conflict of the Accents in Latin Verse*

BY PROFESSOR ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

*Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit, sang Horace,¹ et artis
Intulit agresti Latio.*

The question as to the nature of the accent of Latin had come to an *impasse*, one group of scholars maintaining that it was primarily stress,² and the other accepting the statement of Latin grammarians that it was characterized by a change of pitch, until Professor Frank Frost Abbott published his brilliant article³ on the subject, with an interpretation which receives my complete adherence. Briefly, he accepts the usual view that in early times there was a stress accent on the initial syllable, producing vowel syncope and vowel weakening, and that this was replaced by the historical accent, the position of which was fixed by the penultimate law; but he argues — and here is his special point — that presently the educated classes began, under Greek influence, to speak with a pitch accent rather than with a stress accent, while the uneducated continued to employ an accent of stress, and that in the fourth century of our era this stress accent again gained the mastery, ousting the pitch accent entirely.

It would be idle here to present at length the interpretation which Professor Abbott has so ably set forth for the conflicting phenomena; but it is desirable to indicate in a few words the chief items of these phenomena. The Roman grammarians speak of the accent in terms of pitch, until about 400 A.D. or later; for the grammarians were concerned with the speech of the cultured only, not with that of the rabble. When about 400 A.D. four grammarians speak in

¹ *Epist.* II, I, 156 f.

² So even the latest writer on the subject, E. H. Sturtevant, *Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, 206 ff.

³ *Class. Phil.* II, 444-460.

terms indicating a stress accent, it is evidence that the accent of the populace is gaining the mastery. But in the intervening centuries, the loss or the change of some unaccented vowels in the popular speech testifies to a stress accent there, which is not evidenced by similar changes in cultured speech. Further, popular poetry shows signs of an accentual rather than of a quantitative rhythm. The responsible parties for this splitting of Latin into two social strata were the schoolmasters, who in the earlier times were Greeks, either slave or free: they may naturally have spoken Latin with a pitch accent, like that of their mother tongue — for the Greek of that time had a pitch accent, not a stress accent.

The employment of a pitch accent among the Romans might easily have passed for a choice and fashionable accomplishment. Do I mean that the educated Roman spoke Latin with a Greek accent? Yes, I do mean precisely that. The influence of the teacher on the language of the pupil is stronger than we teachers at times pessimistically opine. Situations more or less parallel to that at Rome may be found elsewhere. In our own country I have heard an emphatic complaint that the Spanish learned in many schools has a pronounced Germanic flavor, since many of the teachers are dispossessed teachers of German. A few years ago, the story was current that the English learned in Japan was taught by industrious Teutons, and the young Japanese was speaking English, if he spoke it at all, with a marked *kaiserlicher Akzent*. In the Sanskrit drama, kings and priests speak pure Sanskrit, but women and inferior characters, being uneducated, speak dialects of Prakrit. The nearest parallel may be found in some of our own colleges and schools, where teachers of English or Canadian birth are in special favor because of the effect which, it is hoped, they will bring about in the speech of their pupils. But to return to Latin: in the matter of accent, we may say with Horace, "captured Greece took captive her wild conqueror."

The problem which I wish to discuss, however, is the re-

lation of the accent of Latin words to the accent of Latin verse. That *arma virúmque cáno* became *arma virúmque canó* as soon as it became the beginning of a hexameter line, is inherently improbable, especially when Cicero — no mean authority on Latin elocution, despite his notorious hexameters — distinctly says that the accent of poetry did not differ from that of prose.⁴ Various attempts have been made to reconcile these seeming contradictions, the most plausible of which is that of Professor Charles E. Bennett: "We are to conceive of a line of Latin poetry as consisting simply of a regular arrangement of long and short syllables, — nothing more. To read Latin poetry, therefore, it is necessary simply to pronounce the words with the proper quantity."⁵ In other words, as Professor Bennett says elsewhere, the long syllables have a natural prominence which gives a rhythm if they are properly pronounced. But where is the prominence of those long syllables if the verse start with three or four spondees? Professor Bennett replies that a purely quantitative rhythm is possible on some musical instruments, such as the organ, where if the player does not use the swell there is no variation in intensity, but the mind of the hearer supplies the rhythm. Just here is the critical point; for in reading verse, the reader is a hearer also, and if the mind of the reader, as hearer, supplies a rhythm, this rhythm will automatically find expression in the reading, unless the reader is capable of dual personality at one and the same time. And despite Professor Bennett's own charming manner of reading Latin verse, he fails to convince me that the Romans read in that way.

We have, I fear, approached the problem from the wrong end. We have been asking how we can reconcile the accents of Latin words with the accent of Latin verse, and have sought

⁴ *De Or.* III, 176-177; *Or.* 189-190. Cf. also Quint. *Inst.* IX, 4, 61, and C. E. Bennett, "Theory and Practice in the Reading of Classical Verse," *University of Pennsylvania Bulletin*, XX, 1 (Oct. 1, 1919), pp. 367-368.

⁵ In the Introduction to his edition of Vergil's *Aeneid*, pp. xvii f.; cf. also *A. J. P.* XIX, 361-383, and the reference in the preceding note.

to make the known accents of the words apply to the same words when in the verse, or else we have cast away the accents of prose entirely when we have read Roman poetry. The question should have been: What was the origin of the verse schemes of the Romans, and how were those original meters read? The answer to the first part of the query is well known: the Romans got their measures from the Greeks. The so-called Saturnian measure, it is true, was native to Italy, but its clumsiness and irregularity were such that upon contact with the polished meters of the Greeks the Romans cast it aside, and adopted the dactylic hexameter and the iambic trimeter — these chiefly, though not to the exclusion of other measures, and the natural disabilities of Latin⁶ were such that the iambic trimeter was modified into the iambic senarius. In this matter, also, “captured Greece took captive her wild conqueror.”

The Greek language had an accent which was of a pitch nature; and in poetry this word accent did not necessarily fall on the same syllable as the metrical accent. Now the metrical accent of Greek verse was long ago shown by several eminent scholars, both on the authority of passages in the Greek writers on metrics and for other considerations, to have been of a stress character.⁷ Is there then in Greek also a conflict of the two accents? Let us not forget that in later centuries the accent of Greek words became one of stress, and that thereafter Greek poetry was composed in such a way that the metrical accents coincided with the word accents. Evidently there would have been a conflict of some sort if the stress accents of the separate words and the metrical accents had fallen on different syllables — which argues that the two were accents of the same character, that

⁶ I refer especially to the reduction of the percentage of short syllables in the language, under the operation of the primitive Italic initial stress accent. Cf. also D. P. Lockwood, “The Limitations of Latin Poetry,” *P. A. P. A.* I, xiii f.

⁷ E.g., G. L. Hendrickson, *A. J. P.* XX, 198–210; Paul Shorey, *T. A. P. A.* XXXVIII, 83 f., *Class. Phil.* VIII, 102.

is, of stress. This argues further the presence in Greek verse of an earlier date, of a metrical accent of stress, and not of some other nature; also, that a conflict between accents was unpleasing to the Greek aesthetic sense. Therefore, the ancient Greek found no conflict in the verse.

But the solution is quite simple: the prose or word accent was one of pitch, the metrical accent was one of stress (or intensity). The two are not in any way incompatible; the examination of any collection of songs or hymns will show that the heavy beat of the measure is not necessarily the high note. To be sure, the statement is often made, that an accent of higher pitch accompanies an accent of stress;⁸ but as a matter of fact, the stress may be on one syllable and the high pitch on another. For instance, Swedish preserves a pitch accent, normally on the accented syllable; but in some words which originally had the accent and therefore the higher pitch on the ultima, the stress has retreated to the initial syllable while the high pitch has remained on the final.⁹

The Greek verse which was the model of the first Roman writers who used Greek measures — Ennius, Plautus, etc. — was one wherein the pitch accents of the single words might or might not coincide with the stress accents of the meter. What was the unfortunate Roman writer to do? His word accent was — as yet — one of stress, not one of higher pitch; but quantity was the basis of the Greek verse, and quantity therefore must not be violated in its Roman imitation. Some conflicts were inevitable, unless the Roman rigorously rejected, in measures that did not permit the substitution of two shorts for an accented long, every word in which the accent fell on a short penult of a dissyllable or on the short antepenult of a polysyllable. Perforce he admitted many conflicts of the accents; but in the nature of things it was

⁸ Cf. E. Seelmann, *Aussprache des Latein*, 19.

⁹ Cf. A. L. Elmquist, *Swedish Phonology*, 14, for a list of pairs of Swedish words of unlike meanings, distinguished from each other only by a difference in the position of the high pitch, while the stress accent stands in both on the initial syllable.

easy for him to make the last two or three stresses of the dactylic hexameter accord with the word accents. In the iambic measure, conditions were different, but Sturtevant's recent researches have shown conclusively that Plautus and Terence have a far greater harmony of word accent and metrical accent than can be explained as the result of mere chance.¹⁰ Thus the earlier Roman writers did seek to alleviate the conflict of accents; but their rhythm still remained rough — a proposition which would hardly be disputed by the most inveterate *laudator temporis acti*.

The versification of the period from 100 B.C. onward shows a tremendous improvement in smoothness and polish. No doubt the continued use of the Greek measures contributed to the improvement: practice makes perfect. But the great advance came just at the time when the speech of the *educated* Roman had by Greek influence been transformed from a language with a strong stress accent to one with an accent of musically higher pitch.¹¹ The simple interpretation of the phenomena which we observe, is that Latin was now, like its Greek model, possessed of a word accent of higher pitch, which might or might not coincide with the metrical accent of stress. In this respect also, then, "captured Greece took captive her wild conqueror."

¹⁰ *Class. Phil.* XIV, 235-244. In passing, I venture to suggest that the optional short quantity of long syllables after a short syllable, if preceded or followed by a metrical stress, is only the result of a strong stress accent: this strong stress accent (here the verse accent) weakens a neighboring unaccented syllable. The shortening, be it noted, occurs only adjacent to an accent, which is the agent responsible for the shortening; and it occurs only after a short syllable, for this is the only position in which a short syllable is imperatively demanded instead of an unavoidable long.

¹¹ It is not my meaning that a pitch accent is without a simultaneous stress element, and vice versa. But an accent in which pitch is 80 to 90 per cent and stress is 20 to 10 per cent, is to be termed a pitch accent, and one in which stress forms 80 to 90 per cent, or more, as in English, is a stress accent; and these terms may be used without any implied denial of the twofold nature. But the minor factor in each case may readily be transferred to another syllable and there strengthened, without interfering with the characteristic nature of the original accent in its original position.

From a practical standpoint, in the reading of Latin verse according to this theory, three rules should be observed :

- I. The syllables should be read with the proper quantity.
- II. The syllables which receive accents in continuous prose discourse¹² should be pronounced at a higher pitch.¹³
- III. The syllables receiving the metrical accent should be sounded with a heavier stress or intensity.

Postscript remark : The greater or less avoidance of coincidence of the two accents in certain portions of the verse, may be for the purpose of avoiding monotony in the melody.¹⁴

To illustrate, I here present the opening verses of the *Aeneid* with musical notation, for reading :¹⁵



Ar - ma vi - rum - que ca - no, Troi - jae qui pri - mus ab o - ris

I - ta - li - am, fa - to pro - fu - gus, La - vin - ja - que ve - nit

Li - to - ra, mul - t' il - l'et ter - ris jac - ta - tus et al - to.

¹² Throughout this discussion, the term 'word accent' has been used to apply to those stresses which are sounded in continuous discourse. I have refrained from using the term 'phrase accent' or 'sentence accent,' since they are misleading. A phrase or sentence in English, for example, often has one chief accent far surpassing in intensity that laid on any other syllable; yet there will be minor accents occurring about every second or third syllable, which are of importance from a rhythmical standpoint, and are included under the denomination 'accents in continuous prose discourse.'

¹³ Dion. H. *Comp. Verb.* § 58 Usener-Radermacher, quoted in the original and in translation by Sturtevant, *Pronunciation*, 193 f., states that the musical interval between the pitch-accented syllable and the remaining unaccented syllables is a fifth.

¹⁴ I am inclined to believe that the phenomena which Sturtevant, *Class. Phil.* XIV, 373-385, finds in the dactylic hexameter, are merely by-products of the development described above.

¹⁵ If Latin verse be not read but sung, one must assume practices similar to those of Greek, as illustrated in the Delphic hymns: an unaccented syllable

Similarly, the following would be the notation for the first stanza of Horace, *Odes*, I, 38:¹⁶



Per - si - cos o - di, pu - er, ap - pa - ra - tus, Dis - pli -

cent nec-sae phi - ly - ra co - ro - nae; Mit - te sec - ta -

ri, ro - sa quo lo - co - rum Se - ra mo - re - tur.

EPILOGUE

It was about 400 A.D. that the popular stress accent ousted the pitch accent in the speech of the educated. This situation is reflected in the Christian hymns of the period, which are prevaillingly accentual, though a dissyllable with long ultima is often accented on the ultima in defiance of the word accent. But the accentual nature of the rhythm appears in that a short syllable bearing the word accent, or two syllables removed from the word accent, freely takes the metrical accent. Once in a while, a short syllable just before or after the word accent has the metrical stress, while the syllable bearing the word accent is left unstressed — an infelicity, to say the least.

A few specimens follow, in which the variations from either the quantitative or the accentual scheme are abnormally frequent.

was not normally sung on a note higher than the accented syllable of the same word, and when a circumflexed syllable was slurred the first part was sung on a higher note than the second part; cf. Sturtevant, *Pronunciation*, 198, with references.

¹⁶ To show the true syllabification, I have written *nec-sae* for *nexae* in the second line. Similarly, I have written *Troi-jae* for *Trojae* in the Vergilian passage.

Hilary (died 367), verses 17-20 of the hymn beginning
Lucis largitor splendide:

Tuoque plena spiritu,
Secum Deum gestantia,
Ne rapientis perfidi
Diris patescant fraudibus.

Every line consists of four iambs. The ultimas of three dissyllables (*secum*, *Deum*, *diris*) bear the metrical stress, and the short initial syllable of *rapientis*, two syllables from the accented syllable, does likewise.

Ambrose (340-397), the opening verses of *Tristes erant apostoli*:

Tristes erant apostoli
De nece sui Domini,
Quem poena mortis crudeli
Servi damnarant impii.
Sermone blando angelus
Praedixit mulieribus.

The meter is the same as in the preceding selection. The metrical stress stands on the ultimas of three words (*tristes*, *erant*, *servi*), on the short accented syllables of four (*nece*, *sui*, *Domini*, *mulieribus*), on a short syllable distant two syllables from the accent in one word (*mulieribus*; so also on its short final, but a stress on a short syllable ending the verse is allowable in nearly all Latin meters), and on the first and third syllables of one trisyllable with a long penult (*crudeli*).

The following shows syncope to *em'nus* and *aeth're*, or else substitution of anapaests for iambs; but syncope is a common feature of popular and late Latin:¹⁷

Ambrose, the opening verses of *Vox clara*:

Vox clara, ecce, intonat,
Obscura quaeque increpat,
Pellantur eminus somnia
Ab aethere Christus promicat.

¹⁷ Cf. C. H. Grandgent, *Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, 91 f., 98-102.

Similar variations between the two accentual systems are seen in the trochaic stanza:

Augustine (354-430), verses 55-60 of *Ad perennis vitae fontem*:

Mutabilibus exuti
Repetunt originem,
Et praesentem veritatis
Contemplantur speciem,
Fontis hinc vivi vitalem
Hauriunt dulcedinem.

Like metrical lapses can easily be found in any collection of English hymns, a fact which should go far toward reconciling us to some conflicts of word accent and metrical stress in Latin verse. But this defect is in English not restricted to the hymnal: for instance, Matthew Arnold has the iambic line,

The sweetest harp-player in Catana,

where a metrical stress falls on the ultima of 'harp-player,' and only the most careful reading can make the line sound rhythmical.¹⁸ And that is a phenomenon identical with that which we find in older and in later Latin, when the word accent was one of energy or stress.

But the identity of development in Greek and in Latin — the change from a quantitative to an accentual rhythm when, in Greek certainly and in Latin probably, the word accent ceased to be one of pitch and became one of stress —

¹⁸ So also often when the verse-stress falls on 'is,' 'the,' and 'and,' when 'between' and 'because' are trochees, and 'elsewhere' is an iamb. Such lines are cited by T. D. Goodell, *Chapters on Greek Metric*, 164 n., who adds: "Of course it is possible to say that these are bad lines. To that one can only reply, 'Is it likely that the objector is a better judge, in a matter of verse-technic, than poets who were so well-trained and so successful in the practice of the art as those quoted (*viz.*, Keats, Shelley, Tennyson, M. Arnold)?'" The answer to this was long ago given by a still greater master of verse than any of those quoted, William Shakespeare, when he put into Portia's mouth the words, "I can easier teach twenty what were good to be done, than be one of the twenty to follow mine own teaching."

affords strong confirmation to the view that in the classical period of both languages the verse was read with a word accent of higher pitch and a metrical accent of greater stress, the presence of the one being in no wise incompatible with the simultaneous presence of the other, whether on the same or on different syllables.

III. — *Prorsus*

BY PROFESSOR JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN *Studies in Philology*, xvii, 402 ff. I published some Marginalia, which, as the name implied, were in their origin marginal notes on subjects which had attracted my attention. Some of these represented the accumulations of more than twenty years and might be said to be ripe for printing. The one on *prorsus* was prematurely published, in part because our lexicons, grammars, and commentators give no idea of the extent to which the word is used, besides containing some misleading statements. Thus Lejay, on Hor. *Serm.* i, 5, 70, refers the use of *prorsus* as a means of expressing the superlative degree only to Sallust, Curtius, and Cicero in his Letters,¹ and says that *prorsus* was avoided by poets.² Since the volume of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* which is to contain words beginning with *P* is not likely to appear for some time, the following notes may have a temporary value.

The adjective *prorsus*, except in a few technical terms, means 'prose,' either as an adjective or as a feminine substantive (*sc. oratio*). The form *prorsa* seems to be rare; it is found in Apul. *Flor.* 18 (p. 90, l. 2, Hild.), iam et prorsa et vorsa facundia veneratus sum, where the form is obviously influenced by that of *vorsa*; and there was a birth-goddess Prorsa, mentioned by Gellius, xvi, 16, 4 in a quotation from Varro.

The usual form of the adverb is *prorsus*; *prorsum* is found at all periods, but not in all writers.³ There seems to be no

¹ It was the surprising inadequacy of this statement that led me to misread the notes which I had taken and say that Lejay attributed *prorsus* in the sense of 'in a word' to Curtius.

² See below, p. 37.

³ Lucretius always has the form in *-um*; *-us* and *-um* occur with about equal frequency in Plautus (7:8) and Terence (11:9). The following writers have only *prorsus*: Lucilius (2), Ennius (1), Varro, *Sat. Men.* (1), Cicero,

difference in meaning between *prorsus* and *prorsum*, and no satisfactory reason for the use of one form rather than the other has been discovered. It might be supposed that *prorsum* would be used by poets for metrical convenience, and that was doubtless sometimes the case; but they use it before consonants as well as before vowels. *Prosus* occurs in Plaut. *Trin.* 730 (*codd.* C and D have *prorsus*), *Most.* 307, *Epid.* 581 (*cod.* A); Ter. *Hec.* 673 (*cod.* A); Cic. *Fam.* XIII, 13 (*codd.* H and D have *prorsus*); Fronto, p. 115 Naber. *Prosum* is read in Plaut. *Pers.* 477; Afran. 93 Ribb.; Lucr. III, 514; and *proversus* in Plaut. *Ps.* 955 on the authority of Varro, *L. L.* VII, 81 (*prorsus*, P; *prosusve*, A). *Prossus*, cited by Georges, *Handwörterbuch*⁷, from Plaut. *Asin.* 748, seems to have no manuscript authority; but see Leo on *Bacch.* 146.

I. *Prorsus* is derived from *pro vorsus* (cf. Fest. p. 268 L.) and its original meaning is therefore 'forward, straight ahead, onward,' as opposed to *rursus*, *transvorsus*, and the like. It is used (1) literally, of place: Plaut. *Ps.* 955, ut transversus, non proversus cedit, quasi cancer solet; *Cist.* 700; Enn. *Trag.* 104 Ribb.; Ter. *Hec.* 315; Lucil. 988 Marx,

quid sibi uult, quare fit ut intro vorsus et ad te
spectent atque ferant vestigia se omnia prorsus?

Varro, *Sat. Men.* 28, mortales multi rursus ac prorsus meant; Cic. *Att.* XIV, 20, 4; Arnob. VII, 44.

Prorsus is also used in this sense (2) figuratively and of time: Ter. *Heaut.* 140, ita facio prorsus, 'that's what I've been doing from that moment';⁴ Eun. 332, *Ad.* 520; Apul.

Orations (14), Sallust (8), Phaedrus (3), Curtius (4), Statius (1), Juvenal (1), Justinus (14), Quintilian (12), Seneca (5), Ausonius (1), Dictys (5), Scriptores Historiae Augustae (19). The same thing is true of Cicero's Philosophical Works (44), except for *prorsum* in *Leg.* III, 49, and of 23 examples from the Letters. Apuleius seems to have but 3 cases of *-um* out of 59 examples, and after his time *prorsum* is very rare, so far as the lexicons and indices may be trusted.

⁴ Unless otherwise indicated, the translations are from the volumes of the Loeb Classical Library.

de Deo Socr. 3 (p. 118, l. 4, Hild.), quos deos Plato existimat naturas incorporales . . . prorsus et retro aeviternas; Arnob. II, 4, verum haec omnia inlustrius commemorabuntur . . . cum ulterius prorsus fuerimus evecti.

II. A second meaning of *prorsus* is closely allied to the first, namely, 'straight, straightway, directly.' (1) Literally, of place: Plaut. *Mil.* 1193, prorsum Athenas protinus abibo tecum; *Bacch.* 146, *Pers.* 677; Cato, ap. Fest. p. 268 L.; Ter. *Ad.* 550; Gell. XVI, 19, 17, tum Arionem prorsus ex eo loco Corinthum petivisse. Also (2) figuratively and of time: Ter. *Eun.* 254, hic homines prorsum ex stultis insanos facit, 'he turns fools straight into bedlamites'; Lucil. 918 Marx; Cic. *Fam.* IV, 10, 2, quod si nullum haberes sensum nisi oculorum, prorsus tibi ignoscerem.

III. By far the most common meaning of *prorsus* is 'exceedingly, absolutely, utterly, quite,' a development from the original signification similar to that of *praeclarus* and other compounds of *prae* with intensive force. This is the most frequent use of the word at all periods. It occurs in almost all the writers who use the word at all and with many of them it is the only meaning.⁵

In this sense *prorsus* may modify (1) a verb: Plaut. *Aul.* 397, sed cesso, priusquam prorsus perii, currere? Ter. *Eun.* 306, ita prorsum oblitus sum mei, 'I've utterly lost myself'; Cic. *Fin.* II, 27, rem ipsam prorsus probo.

Prorsus may modify (2) an adjective (a) in the positive degree: Plaut. *Most.* 307, ne . . . quisquam invidet prorsus commodis; Phaedr. II, 1, 11, exemplum egregium prorsus et laudabile; Boeth. *Consol.* I, 2, cum me non modo tacitum sed elinguem prorsus mutumque vidisset; rarely (b) in the comparative: Justinus, V, 7, 11, feliciores prorsus priores urbis ruinas ducentes . . . quae tectorum tantum ruina

⁵ This use, including *prorsus ut* and *prorsus quasi*, is the predominant one in Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Apuleius, the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, and perhaps in Sallust; it is the only one in Cicero's *Orations* and *Philosophical Works*, and the predominant one in his *Letters*, so far as my examples go.

taxatae sunt; or (c) in the superlative: Juv. 6, 249, dignissima⁶ prorsus Florali matrona tuba; Apul. *Flor.* 16 (p. 64, l. 7, Hild.).

Prorsus may modify (3) an adverb: Ter. *Ad.* 761, ipsa si cupiat Salus, servare prorsus non potest hanc familiam, 'it's absolutely beyond the power of Providence itself to save this household'; Cic. *Fam.* VI, 20, 2, hoc mihi prorsus valde placet; Gell. XVIII, 2, 1, Saturnalia Athenis agitabamus hilare prorsum ac modeste.

Prorsus sometimes appears to modify a noun: Cic. *Verr.* IV, 137, a Syracusanis prorsus nihil adiumenti expectabam, *Tusc.* I, 9, prorsus nemo; or a pronoun: Lucr. III, 45, nec prorsum quicquam nostrae rationis egere, 'and they have no need at all of our philosophy' (Munro). As a matter of fact, however, *prorsus* emphasizes the negative adverb implied in *nemo* and *nihil*,⁷ and *quicquam* is virtually an adverb. It may be noted too that *nemo* is sometimes used as an adjective: Ter. *Eun.* 1082, accipit homo nemo melius prorsus neque prolixius, 'there isn't a creature living that entertains better or more splendidly.' Here *prorsus*, in spite of its position, modifies *nemo*.

This emphatic *prorsus* is very frequently used to strengthen an assertion, either positive or negative. From the lexical point of view there seems to be no good reason for making a separate category of negative sentences, as the lexicons commonly do,⁸ any more than there is for making one of the ironical use in Curt. IV, 5, 13, grati prorsus coniugibus . . . revertimur. The irony has nothing to do with the use of *prorsus*, since a superlative *gratissimi* would have had the same force.

IV. By emphasizing the second of two related words *prorsus* acquires the meaning 'more than that, indeed, in

⁶ It is perhaps accidental that *prorsus* is often used with *dignus* (Curt. IV, 4, 11, IX, 3, 9, X, 6, 13; Sen. *Phaed.* 853, *Herc. Oet.* 1482), but *dignissimus* is not very common.

⁷ *Prorsus* is very common with these words, as well as with *nullus*.

⁸ So also Hand, *Tursellinus*, IV, 619.

fact': Pliny, *N. H.* xxxiii, 9, manus et prorsus sinistrae maximam auctoritatem conciliavere auro, 'hands and a sinister hand at that' (Riley); Apul. *Met.* xi, 12, placido et prorsus humano gradu . . . sensim inrepo; Quint. *Inst.* xii, 10, 27, Latina facundia . . . similis Graecae ac prorsus discipula eius; Cic. *Fam.* iv, 10, 1, venies exspectatus, neque solum nobis . . . sed prorsus omnibus; Apul. *Met.* v, 19, maritum incerti status et prorsus lucifugam tolero.⁹

V. The remaining uses of *prorsus* are influenced by its place in the sentence and by the context. In I-IV the position of *prorsus*, except in so far as it is affected by considerations of metrical convenience, is as a rule the usual one of an adverb modifying a verb, adjective, or other adverb. Its position with adjectives is shown by the examples under III, 2 and by Curt. ix, 3, 9, digna prorsus cogitatio animo tuo. *Prorsus* gradually shows a tendency to drift to other parts of the sentence, especially to its beginning. Through its position it may modify words or phrases other than those included under I-IV, or it may be somewhat loosely attached to the sentences as a whole. We have a somewhat similar phenomenon in the dative of the indirect object as compared with the dative of reference with its various subdivisions.

Thus through its position *prorsus* may modify (1) a noun (even when it does not contain or imply a negative adverb, as above): Quint. *Decl.* 252 (p. 6, l. 36, Bonnell), unde tantus et tam prorsus domi tuae tumultus; Apul. *de Deo Socr.* 16 (p. 149, l. 9, Hild.), hic quem dico prorsus custos, singularis praefectus; *Met.* iv, 15, fortissimum socium nostrum prorsus bestiam factum, 'our brave companion, now a perfect beast' (Butler). It may modify (2) a pronoun (even when the pronoun is not used adverbially, as above): Cic.

⁹ In the last two examples one might suspect the meaning found in III, 2, but the first three are manifestly of a different kind. Somewhat similar are Lucr. vi, 528, omnia, prorsum omnia, and Apul. *Met.* x, 22, totum, sed prorsus totum. We have an inversion of the emphasis in Apul. *Met.* iii, 14, adiuro . . . nulli me prorsus ac ne tibi quidem ipsi adseveranti posse credere.

Att. IV, 12, prorsus id facies; Quint. *Inst.* IX, 4, 121, illud prorsus oratoris, scire ubi quoque genere compositionis sit utendum. It may be drawn (3) to a prepositional phrase or an equivalent: Plaut. *Pers.* 677, simulato quasi eas prorsum in navem; Aus. *de Hered.* 29 (p. 17 Peiper), haec mihi nec procul urbe sita est nec prorsus ad urbem; Cic. *Tusc.* I, 11, prorsus isto modo, 'precisely as you put it' (Nutting). It may modify (4) a conjunction, as in *prorsus ut*, on which see Wölfflin, *Arch. f. lat. Lex.* IV, 618 ff.¹⁰ *Prorsus quasi* occurs several times in Justinus and is found also in Apul. *Met.* VIII, 27, prorsus quasi deum praesentia solebant homines non sui fieri melius sed debiles officii vel aegroti; IX, 9, prorsus quasi possent tanti facinoris evadere supplicium. Quintilian has *cum prorsus* in *Inst.* VI, 3, 48, quia rare belle respondeant, nisi cum prorsus rebus ipsis adiuvantur. Finally *prorsus* (5) is used loosely with the entire sentence: Cic. *Tusc.* I, 65, prorsus haec divina mihi videtur vis; *Leg.* II, 24, prorsus maiorem quidem rem nullam sciscam aliter, in minoribus, si voles, remittam hoc tibi. On *prorsus* in the former of these two examples Professor Nutting has one of the very few comments which editors make on this word, namely, "'Beyond a doubt.' This meaning is not far removed from the familiar signification 'outright.'" Under this head the use of *prorsus* by Sallust may be considered, since in many cases the meaning is determined by the position of the word and by the context. In his eight examples of the word Sallust puts *prorsus* first in every case except one, *Cat.* 16, 5, sed ea prorsus opportuna Catilinae, where we have the common usage of III, 2. In *Cat.* 15, 5, prorsus in facie voltuque vecordia inerat, there is no word to which *prorsus* may naturally be attached, but it seems to have the loose connection with the whole sentence which has just been mentioned. Here Kritz rendered *prorsus* by 'ut paucis

¹⁰ We must distinguish cases in which *ut* is adverbial: e.g., Apul. *Met.* IX, 34, nuntians omne vinum . . . ferventi calore et prorsus ut igne copioso subdito rebullire; *Apul.* 94, (rescripsit mihi) prorsus ut 'vir bonus dicendi peritus.'

complectar,' a translation which in the form of 'in short, in a word' has been adopted rather generally. Kritz gives the same meaning to *prorsus* in *Cat.* 23, 2; 25, 5; *Jug.* 30, 3; 66, 1; 76, 4 (omitting *Jug.* 23, 1, which does not seem to differ from the other examples which he cites); Wölfflin, however (*op. cit.* 619), cites two of these sentences (*Jug.* 23, 1; 30, 3) to illustrate the intensive use of *prorsus* (III, 2). As a matter of fact, in each of these six sentences *prorsus* is followed, in four of them immediately, by an adjective (three times) and by *nihil*. In those cases it is difficult to believe that *prorsus* does not have intensive force, although it may also have a second meaning by the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction, since an enumeration of particulars precedes. This second meaning however is rather 'indeed, in fact' than 'in short.'¹¹ This seems to be the only possible meaning in *Cat.* 15, 5, unless we take *prorsus* with *vecordia* and translate the two words by 'utter madness.'

This use of *prorsus* in the sense of 'in fact' is rare. In *Lucr.* III, 514, aut aliquid prosum de summa detrahare hylum, Munro translates 'or withdraw in short some little from the whole.' It seems to be one of the usages in which Tacitus followed Sallust: e.g., *Hist.* II, 5, prorsus si avaritia abesset, antiquis ducibus par, 'indeed, save for avarice, he matched the generals of old days' (Murphy); III, 83, prorsus ut eandem civitatem et furere crederes et lascivire; *Ann.* VI, 4, metum prorsus et noxae conscientiam pro foedere haberi. Other examples are: *Apul. Apol.* 21, prorsus ad vivendum velut ad natandum is melior qui onere liberior; *Flor.* 9 (p. 40, l. 7, Hild.), prorsus omnis tuas virtutes ita effingit . . . ut . . . admirabilior esset in iuvene quam in te parta laus, 'in a word, he presents such a perfect pattern and likeness of your virtues that . . .' (Butler). Also in *Flor.* 9 (p. 38,

¹¹ The meaning 'in fact' is closely connected with that of 'more than that' (IV) in which *prae* has one of its regular meanings, 'forward'; this is not true of 'in short.' On the ἀπὸ κοινοῦ construction see *Studies in Philology*, XVII, 427.

l. 3), we find *prorsum* non eo infitias nec radio nec subula . . . uti nosse, where it is difficult to separate *prorsus* from *non*, although it may also have the meaning 'as a matter of fact,' ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. We may add three examples from the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*: Alex. Sev. 41, 2, *prorsus* censuram suis temporibus de propriis moribus gessit; Gord. 13, 4, *prorsus* furere videbatur; *Carac.* 9, 3, *prorsus* nihil inter fratres simile, where again it is difficult to separate *prorsus* from the following negative.

To summarize the above, *prorsus* is used much more extensively than one would infer from the books of reference. Its most frequent use is as an intensive adverb. The meaning 'in short' is doubtful; that of 'more than that, in fact' may be logically connected with the other meanings of the word and occurs in a few writers. The meaning of *prorsus* is affected by its position in the sentence and by the context. The statement that the poets avoid *prorsus* is true only if 'avoid' is taken in a very broad sense, or 'poets' in a very restricted one. It occurs quite frequently in Plautus, Terence, Lucretius, Phaedrus, and Seneca, and once or twice in Lucilius, Afranius, an unidentified comic writer (Inc. 59, Ribb.), Ennius, Varro, Horace, Statius, Juvenal, Ausonius, and Prudentius.

Prorsus belongs to the colloquial language, the *sermo cotidianus* rather than the *sermo plebeius*. It is not found in Caesar (nor in Nepos). Cicero uses it sparingly in his Orations and for the most part in his earlier speeches; he uses it very freely in the conversational part of his *Philosophical Works*, mainly in assertions (positive and negative).¹² The word does not occur in Petronius, but Apuleius has 59 instances in the *Metamorphoses*; in his other works it occurs, but much less frequently. Suetonius does not use the word, but the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* have 19 examples.

¹² He seems to use it rather freely in the Letters also. It occurs seven times in the first two books of the *Letters to Atticus*, ten times in Books III-XI.

Prorsus always adds something to the sentence in which it stands; yet it is frequently left untranslated. For example, Apul. *Met.* II, 6, nam et forma scitula et moribus ludicra et prorsus argutula est, 'for she is quite pretty, has a sportive disposition and a charming wit' (Butler). The same translator renders *Met.* X, 15, deierantur utrique nullam se prorsus fraudem . . . factitasse, by 'each swearing that he had never cheated or robbed the other.' The old translation of Adlington, which however often overlooks the word, in this case does it justice by the translation, 'they swear both earnestly that neither of them stole or took away any jot of the meat.' *Prorsus*, too, deserves more attention from the commentators, especially those of more recent date. In this connection a few doubtful passages may be added: Plaut. *Epid.* 581, quid? ego lenocinium facio, qui . . . argentum egurgitem domo prorsus? 'absolutely ingurgitating money out of my house,' where the translator is probably right in connecting *prorsus* with the verb; Plaut. *Frag.* ap. Charis. I, 211, 33. K., ita sunt praedones, prorsus parcent nemini, where we seem to have a paratactic forerunner of the *prorsus ut* construction; Ter. *And.* 510, prorsus a me opinionem hanc tuam esse amotam volo, 'I should like to clear utterly away this opinion you've got of me'; an early example of *prorsus* at the beginning of the sentence, and widely separated from the word which it modifies (*amotam*); Lucr. III, 514, cited above, p. 36; Cic. *Fin.* IV, 54, his propositis tenuit prorsus consequentia, 'he adhered to the logical conclusion from these premises'; Cic. *Off.* III, 30, haec una res prorsus . . . aequae utrisque est propemodum comparanda, 'for in just this one point there is but little difference between the great and the ordinary man'; Stat. *Th.* III, 657, tua prorsus inani | verba polo causas abstrusaeque nomina rerum | eliciunt; Apul. *Met.* V, 8, ut illarum prorsus caelestium divitiarum copiis affluentibus satiatae . . . nutrent invidiam; IX, 18, adigit cuneum, qui rigentem prorsus servi tenacitatem violenter diffinderet; IX, 38, dextra quae tuum prorsus amputasset caput; *ib.*,

gulam sibi prorsus execut;¹³ x, 3, nec te religio patris omnino deterreat, cui morituum prorsus servabis uxorem, 'for thou shalt be the savior of his wife, who else must die' (Butler). This translation throws no light on the meaning of *prorsus*; cf. p. 38, above.

¹³ In these examples I am inclined to see the meaning 'straightway'; Hildebrand takes *prorsus* in the second with *execuit* (III, 3).

IV.—*The Tauric Maiden and Allied Cults*

BY DR. CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE Tauric Maiden is well known to all students of the classics because of her rôle in the *Iphigenia in Tauris* of Euripides. As a blood-thirsty form of Artemis she typifies well the ferocity of some of the barbarous tribes of Southern Russia, but the special character which she bore among her native worshippers is very obscure. A reference in Herodotus, the one play of Euripides, and the coins of the city of Chersonesus are the chief sources of our knowledge. It is the aim of this paper to examine some Old Russian material to see if the peoples to the north of the Black Sea have preserved any traditions which may throw light on her personality.

The Russian *byliny* or heroic epics contain several references to a very unreliable and treacherous character, the White Swan, Byelaya Lebed', whose name is Avdotya or Marya. We will give here a synopsis of the two *byliny* which are the most important in this connection. They are most readily accessible in English in Miss Hapgood's *Epic Songs of Russia*² (1915), and the originals are contained in any of the *bylina* collections, such as those of Kirsha Danilov or Rybnikov.

In the *bylina* of Ivan Godinovich, the hero, Ivan Godinovich, a nephew of Fair Sun Vladimir (Grand Prince of Kiev, 977-1015), desires to marry Avdotya the White Swan, the daughter of the Merchant Dmitry of Chernigov. Koshchey the Deathless is a rival suitor but is rejected. Refusing to acknowledge defeat, he pursues Ivan Godinovich, overtakes him and attacks him. In the first encounter Ivan is victorious but finds he has forgotten his dagger. Instead of assisting her husband, the White Swan helps Koshchey. Ivan is nearly overcome, but is able to conjure more powerfully than his rival. The arrow influenced by the charms rebounds and kills Koshchey. Ivan promises to marry Avdotya, after

teaching her three lessons. In these he cuts off her arms, her lips, and her feet, because her fondness for Koshchey has made these members unnecessary. Lastly he cuts off her head (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 87 ff.). Notice also the description of the White Swan in her father's house: "Upon Avdotya's head were white swans, on her left shoulder black sables; on her right shoulder sat bright falcons; on the frame of her loom perched dark blue doves, and on her loom-bench, black ravens; and her face was like the first fair snows of autumn" (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 90).

The other bylina is that of Sweet Mikhailo Ivanovich the Rover. Vladimir sent three of his *bogatyrs* ('heroes') to perform deeds of valor. Mikhailo Ivanovich was to collect tribute from Podolia the crafty and bring back a writing of submission. On his way home "he wandered by the blue sea, past warm and peaceful bays, shooting swans and geese. As he turned to leave the precipitous shore, he gazed out upon the quiet bay, and beheld a white swan floating there. Through her feathers she was all gold, and her head was covered with red gold, studded with fair round pearls. Then Mikailo drew from his bow-case his stout bow, from his quiver a burning arrow, grasped his bow in his left hand, the arrow in his right, and laid the arrow to the silken cord. As he drew the stout bow to his ear, with the burning arrow of seven ells, the cord twanged, the horns of the great bow creaked, and he would have let fly. But the white swan besought him: 'Ai, Mikailo Ivanovich the Rover, shoot not the white swan, else shalt thou have no luck for evermore!' Then the swan rose over the blue sea upon her white wings, flew to the shore, and turned into a beauteous maiden. Mikailo went to her, took her by her little white hands, by her golden ring, and would fain have kissed her upon her sugar mouth. But the fair maid said: 'Kiss me not, Mikailo Rover, for I am of infidel race, Marya, Princess of Podolia, and unbaptized. If thou wilt take me to glorious Holy Russia, to famous Kief town the royal, I will go to mother church of God, and receive the Christian faith. Then will

we take the golden crowns, and then also shalt thou kiss me if thou wilt.' " Before the wedding in Kiev, Marya and Mikhailo take an oath that if either dies, the other will enter the grave and stay there for three months. Marya dies first. Mikhailo enters the grave, overcomes the Dragon of the underworld and compels her to restore Marya to life. Soon after Tsar Vakramy Vakrameyevich carries Marya off to Volhynia. Mikhailo pursues but Marya uniformly sides with her captor, and Mikhailo is reduced to despair until the sister of Vakramey, Anna the Fair, becomes his ally, and at her solicitation he refuses to give heed to the prayers and charms of Marya and cuts off her guilty head (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 161).

The same figure may appear in the bylina of Dobrynya and Marina. Marina the Vile turns Dobrynya into a bull and in this form he destroys the cattle of his aunt Avdotya Ivanovna, who compels the witch to set him free. Later he marries Marina and kills her (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 81 ff.).

In the bylina of Quiet Dunay Ivanovich, the hero kills his wife Nastasya because she excels him in archery. Overcome with remorse Dunay Ivanovich then kills himself with the words, "Where the white swan fell, . . . there also shall fall the falcon bright." From her blood flowed the Dniepr and from his came the Don (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 25 ff.).

The interpretation of the Russian byliny is rendered more difficult by the fact that the different singers from whom they have been collected frequently vary both the names of the characters and the details of the stories. Thus Avdotya and Marya are parallel names of the White Swan. In the bylina of Mikhailo Ivanovich she is either Marya or Avdotya Likhovidyevna, and her final lover is Vakramey or Okulyev, who carries her to the steppes or to the Land of the Saracens, Zemlyu Saratsinskuyu (Keltuyala, *Kurs istorii russkoy literatury*, Part I, Book I, 515 ff.). In the bylina of Ivan Godinovich, she is Marya, Mitriyevna, Nastasya, or Avdotya, and her home is in the Golden Horde, India the Rich, beyond the glorious blue sea, or in Chernigov. The unsuccessful rival is either Koshchey the Deathless or

Afomey Afomeyevich, etc. (Keltuyala, *op. cit.* 519 f.). The name Marya may be influenced to some extent by Marina Mnischówna, the Polish bride of the False Dmitry of the seventeenth century, since she figures as a witch in Russian folk-poetry, but there seems little evidence that the name was at any time Mora (Death) as suggested by Miss Hapgood (*op. cit.* 272).

During the century and a half since the first discovery of the byliny in the remote communities in North Russia, scholars have endeavored to interpret their meaning. Nature myths, history, and social conditions have been invoked as keys to their interpretation, not to mention attempts to prove them borrowed from Western Europe or from the Mongols and Tatars. At the present time the generally accepted opinion is that they contain a historical basis which has been overlaid with tradition and mythology (Porfirev, *Istoria russkoy slovesnosti*, I, 49 ff.). Keltuyala (*op. cit.* 516 ff.), paying little attention to the swan character of the maiden, endeavors to group these byliny with those which describe unfaithful wives. The relation of Vladimir and Rognyeda, daughter of Rogvolod a prince of the Polovtsy, is also brought into the story. It is, however, very likely that the White Swan contains other elements than Rognyeda, Marina, and the unfaithful wife of folk-lore.

In the first place let us notice the localities mentioned in the byliny of the White Swan. It is assumed that the home of these stories is to be found in Galicia and Volhynia (Keltuyala, *op. cit.* 518). If this is true, we find that in every case the White Swan is placed nearer to the Black Sea and the steppes than is the home of the singer, and that in some versions she is definitely connected with the Tatars and the foes of Russia. Her lovers are almost always typical of some tribe, cult, or principle which is foreign to Holy Russia, and we cannot forget that in some versions she definitely declares herself to be unbaptized.

We should also mention her power of transformation. Superhuman as are the *bogatyr*s, Volga Vseslavich is the

chief hero to employ this power and he is one of the most frankly mythical of the entire group (Hapgood, *op. cit.* 3). Avdotya-Marya possesses this power of self-transformation. Not only does she appear to Mikhailo as a swan, but according to another version she does not accompany Mikhailo to Kiev but resumes her swan's shape and flies back and meets Mikhailo on his arrival (Kirsha Danilov, *Drevniya rossiyskiya stikhotvorennya*, 149).

We shall probably not be far wrong in seeing in the White Swan a faded bird-goddess, who had laid aside most of her divine characteristics when she merged in the byliny with the type of the unfaithful wife. It may well be asked whether her home was near Kiev and whether her hostility was directed against the Slavs or the Scandinavian *druzhina* of the Grand Princes of Kiev, the Russians in the strict use of the word.

The existence of such a deity may be inferred from the *Armament of Igor*. This poem, which is the oldest Russian heroic epic to be preserved by literary tradition and which can be assigned to the latter part of the twelfth century, gives us the best account of old Russian mythology that we have. This bird-goddess is by no means the smallest problem connected with the poem, which holds high rank in epic poetry for the vigor of its style and the charm of its descriptions.

The chief passage is found in verses 288 ff.: "Obida arose in the armies of the descendant of Dazhbog; stepped as a maiden on the land of Troyan; splashed with swan wings in the blue sea; splashing in the Don, she awakened the heavy times." We may note here that Dazhbog seems to have been a sun-god and that the hosts of the descendant of Dazhbog mean Russia (Porfirev, *op. cit.* 26). The identity of Troyan, which occurs several times in the poem, is still very much disputed, as is that of the poet Boyan (cf. Prince, "The Names *Troyan* and *Boyan* in Old Russian," *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* LVI, 152 ff.). Obida may well be translated as Insult, Offence, and would equal the Greek *Ἵβρις*; and cer-

tain authors such as Vyazemsky (see Magnus, *Tale of the Armament of Igor*, 80) and Rambaud, *La Russie épique*, 417, do not hesitate to see in this passage an imitation of a choral ode of Euripides. Without entering into the vexed question as to the Greek influence in the poem, we may fairly see in the maiden with her swan wings some form of supernatural being connected with Slavonic tradition.

This deity, often called Dyevitsa (the Maiden), is perhaps the female counterpart of Div, the bird of ill omen which predicts the disaster about to overwhelm the soldiers of Igor (vs. 107). Magnus, *op. cit.* 81, stresses in this connection the South Russian confusion of *yat'* and *i*¹, but this should be treated cautiously since only in this word does the Igor make this confusion. Apparently also her home is on or near the Don and it is very likely that *more* ('sea') refers to the river in this poem (cf. vss. 652 and Magnus' note, p. 20).

A similar tale is told among the Tatars. Kartaga Mergän after a desperate fight overcomes Tjektschäkäi, the Swan-Woman, who has come forth to struggle with him, after he slays Kan Tongus and Erd-Aina Tjer-Kara. Victory comes after Kartaga's horses succeed in destroying the Swan-Woman's external soul (Frazer, *Golden Bough*, xi, 144, and Radloff, *Proben der Volksliteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Sibiriens*, II, 524 ff.). In this narrative we notice that the hero, to reach the scene of conflict, takes a long journey across the steppes to the neighborhood of the sea, and that the word 'sea,' as in the other sources, is applied to the Volga and similar rivers (Radloff, *op. cit.* p. xii).

Apparently the byliny and the *Armament of Igor* and perhaps the Tatar legend of the Swan-Maiden all refer to the same figure. We may tentatively regard this as a winged female figure, perhaps connected with the sea and clearly baleful. Whether this means that she is a goddess of the Slavs or of their enemies may be uncertain. Finally, the centre of the deity's worship is to the east of Kiev and prob-

¹ *Yat'*, the Cyrillic equivalent for *ž*, becomes *z* in Great Russian but *i* in South Russian (Ukrainian).

ably along the Don and the Sea of Azov. This at once brings to mind the Virgin Goddess of the Crimea mentioned by Strabo, 308: ἐν ᾗ τὸ τῆς Παρθένου ἱερόν, δαίμονός τινος, ἥς ἐπώνυμος καὶ ἡ ἄκρα ἡ πρὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶν ἐν σταδίοις ἑκατόν, καλουμένη Παρθένιον, ἔχον νεὼν τῆς δαίμονος καὶ ξόανον.

Herodotus is the earliest extant author to leave us a description of Scythia and the manners and customs of its people. The list of gods which he gives in iv, 59 does not seem to offer us any assistance, but in 103 he describes a form of human sacrifice among the Tauri: θύουσι μὲν τῇ παρθένῳ τοὺς τε ναυηγούς καὶ τοὺς ἂν λάβωσι Ἑλλήνων ἐπαναχθέντες τρόπῳ τοιῷδε· καταρξάμενοι ῥοπάλῳ παίουσι τὴν κεφαλὴν. οἱ μὲν δὴ λέγουσι, ὥς τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ ὠθέουσι κάτω (ἐπὶ γὰρ κρημνοῦ ἴδρυται τὸ ἱρόν), τὴν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυροῦσι, οἱ δὲ κατὰ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν ὁμολογέουσιν, τὸ μέντοι σῶμα οὐκ ὠθέεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ κρημνοῦ λέγουσι, ἀλλὰ γῇ κρύπτεσθαι. τὴν δὲ δαίμονα ταύτην, τῇ θύουσι, λέγουσι αὐτοὶ Ταῦροι Ἰφιγένειαν τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος εἶναι. Euripides developed this in the *Iphigenia in Tauris*. In this play the victims are killed with a knife and the bodies are burned (622 ff.). He also connects the statue of the Tauric Artemis with the Artemis Ταυροπόλος and the Artemis Βραυρωνία (1453 ff.). Various other authors mention the cult, as Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii, 8, 33, but very few details are added; and we must consider the personality of the different goddesses concerned, if we would discover anything further about the cult.

There is strong evidence that at one time Iphigenia was an independent goddess. Thus Pausanias, vii, 26, 5, tells us that at Aegira the temple of Artemis contained a statue of Iphigenia: εἰ δὲ ἀληθῆ λέγουσιν οὗτοι, δῆλός ἐστιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἰφιγενεία ποιηθεὶς ὁ ναός. Similarly Pausanias, ii, 35, 1, mentions a temple of Artemis Iphigenia in Hermione. A comparison of the different cults of Iphigenia suggests that she was a goddess of birth and fruit, chthonic in character and death-bringing (cf. Pauly-Wissowa, ix, 2589). Her worship, which centred on the east coast of Greece, seems to have been similar in character to that of the winged 'Persian

Artemis' and she herself was related to the great nature goddess of primitive Greece. At an early date she coalesced with Artemis and ultimately descended from divinity to priestess and served Artemis who succeeded her as goddess. This subordination however could hardly have taken place until after the Greeks (probably Milesians) had reached the Crimea and identified the goddess Iphigenia with the Tauric Maiden (Pauly-Wissowa, ix, 2593).

The relationship between the Iphigenia-Maiden and the 'Persian Artemis' is perhaps indicated by the cities which claimed to contain the original statue brought from the Crimea or to have been places visited by Orestes and Iphigenia with the statue. They include Sparta, Argos, Comana in Cappadocia, Comana in Pontus, Castabala in Cataonia, Laodicea in Syria, a city in Lydia, Aricia, and Syracuse (Pauly-Wissowa, ix, 2596).

It is difficult to explain satisfactorily the various cults of Artemis such as *Ταυροπόλος*, *Ταυρώ*, *Ὀρθία*, etc. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, II, 454, denies the possibility that *Ταυρώ* and such cult epithets could be borrowed from the Crimea, because the cults seem to be far earlier than the entrance of the Greeks into the Euxine. The whole discussion of these cults and their relations to Lemnos (cf. Plut. *de Mul. Virt.* 247 A, E) does not throw much light on the Tauric Maiden. Similarly the *ἄρκτευσις* of Brauron and the bear-dances are Greek rather than Pontic. There were in Greece itself certain wild cults of Artemis, such as the Artemis *Ὀρθία* of Sparta (Paus. III, 16, 9), and the Greeks found it very easy to connect these cults with the Crimea and to see in the Tauric Maiden the same goddess whom they were worshipping at home.

It would be tempting to consider the Tauric Maiden a form of the winged Artemis in view of Paus. III, 16, 8: *ἀμφισβητοῦσι δὲ καὶ Λυδῶν οἷς ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Ἀναιτίδος*.² This type was known to the Greeks and appeared

² Compare the Boeotian vase on which Artemis appears with two lions and a bull and two long-necked water-birds (swans ?) [Farnell, *op. cit.* II, 522].

on the well-known Chest of Cypselus (Paus. v, 19, 5): "Αρτεμις δὲ οὐκ οἶδα ἐφ' ὅτῳ λόγῳ πτέρυγας ἔχουσα ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, καὶ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ κατέχει πάρδαλιν, τῇ δὲ ἑτέρα τῶν χειρῶν λέοντα. The same type appears also on the bronze relief from Olympia (*Olympia*, iv, pl. 38) and in Asia Minor on the sarcophagi from Clazomenae (Pottier, *Catalogue des vases antiques de terre cuite du Louvre*, II, p. 506).

Whether or not this was the original type of the Tauric Maiden, there can be no doubt that to the Greek inhabitants of Chersonesus she was fully absorbed in the conventional type of Artemis.³ On the coins of the city she appears as a huntress with bow and spear a short chiton and hunting boots, and often with the mural crown of a tutelary deity (Minns, *op. cit.* 544). It can scarcely be doubted that human sacrifices disappeared at a relatively early date among the Greek settlers, but the Pseudo-Scymnus (*Periplus*, 834 Müller) says, (οἱ Ταῦροι) ἱλασκόμενοι τὰ θεῖα τοῖς ἀσεβήμασιν. With this possible testimony for the second century A.D. we may compare the words of Ammianus Marcellinus of the fourth century: Diis enim hostiis litantes humanis et immolantes capita fani parietibus praefigebant, velut fortium perpetua monumenta facinorum (xxii, 8). The historian here was probably describing earlier times and certainly did not refer to the civilized city of Chersonesus of his day. Apparently human sacrifice was not universal throughout South Russia, since a similar goddess whose shrine was discovered near Yalta contented herself with the jawbones of domestic animals (Minns, *op. cit.* 543, n. 7). The identification with Artemis was made by the Greeks in accordance with their custom of seeing this deity in any foreign divinity who was unmarried, a huntress, and mistress of wild animals, or a goddess of vegetation (Farnell, *op. cit.* II, 484).

Greek tradition may have preserved to us memories of other seats of the Tauric Maiden-Iphigenia-Artemis. After the death of Achilles, his spirit went to the Islands of the

³ Oreshnikov protests against the application of the name Artemis to this divinity (quoted in Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, 543, n. 8).

Blest and these were later localized at Leuce, an island at the mouth of the Danube (cf. Rohde, *Psyche*⁵, II, 371, n. 2). While he was still supposed to be dwelling in Elysium, he received as his wife Medea (Schol. ad. Ap. Rh. iv, 814, ὅτι δὲ Ἀχιλλεὺς εἰς τὸ Ἠλύσιον πεδῖον παραγενόμενος ἔγημε Μήδειαν πρῶτος Ἰβυκος εἶρηκε· μεθ' ὃν Σιμωνίδης).⁴ As early as the *Cypria* (c. 776 B.C.) Iphigenia was carried to the land of the Tauri, but we find no trace of her marriage with Achilles in the Greek dramatists, unless we should consider Euripides, *I.A.* 1405–1406, as an indication of the story. Furthermore, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Pindar do not seem to know of the rescue of Iphigenia by Artemis.

According to Pausanias, I, 43, 1, Hesiod in the *Catalogue of Women* told how Artemis made Iphigenia Hecate after her death: οἶδα δὲ Ἡσίοδον ποιήσαντα ἐν καταλόγῳ γυναικῶν Ἰφιγένειαν οὐκ ἀποθανεῖν, γνώμη δὲ Ἀρτέμιδος Ἐκάτην εἶναι.⁵ Antoninus Liberalis, 27, tells how she lived on Leuce with Achilles under the name Ὀρσιλοχία, an epithet which is applied to Artemis herself in the form *Orsilochē* (Amm. xxii, 8, 33).

These traditions may not unfairly be said to extend the dominion of the Maiden beyond the Peninsula and to connect her with Leuce and Achilles. Dionysius Periegetes, 306–307, says:

Ταῦροί θ' οἱ ναίουσιν Ἀχιλλῆος δρόμον αἰπὺν
Στεινὸν ὁμοῦ δολιχόν τε καὶ αὐτῆς ἐς στόμα λίμνης.

In his commentary on this passage Eustathius quotes Alcaeus, *P. L. G.*⁴ 48 B., Ἀχίλλευ δ' γὰρ Σκυθίας μέδεις, to prove that the husband of Iphigenia was not the celebrated Greek hero but a Scythian ruler who pursued her on the so-called Ἀχιλλέως δρόμος, a sand bar near the mouth of the Dniepr and long connected by the Greeks with Achilles. Wilamo-

⁴ This union of the two Euxine figures might furnish evidence for the original home of Ἀχιλλεὺς, Ποντάρχης in the Euxine instead of the placing of Elysium there (Hirst, *J. H. S.* xxii, 250).

⁵ This may be supported by the inscription to Achilles, probably from the Ἀλσος Ἐκάτης at the mouth of the Dniepr (Hirst, *op. cit.* xxiii, 46).

witz, "Die beiden Elektren," *Herm.* xviii, 251, note, rejects this Scythian Achilles, and Miss Hirst, "Cults of Olbia," *J. H. S.* xxii, 248, denies Scythian influence in the cult of Achilles Ποντάρχης, a very widespread cult at Olbia and throughout the Greek cities on the Euxine. On the other hand Koehler, "Mémoire sur les îles et la course consacrées à Achille," *Mém. de l'acad. de St. Pétersbourg*, iv (1826), 599 ff., argued that the cult of Achilles Ποντάρχης was essentially Scythian. Probably we are to see in it certain Scythian elements, especially as Leuce is described to us as possessing certain elements that may be attached to the Maiden.

Euripides, *I. T.* 435 ff., says :

τὰν πολυόρνιθον ἐπ' αἶαν,
 λευκὰν ἀκτάν, Ἀχιλῆος
 δρόμους καλλισταδίους,
 ἄξεινον κατὰ πόντον.

These birds played a very important rôle on Leuce and the Ἀχιλλέως δρόμος with which Leuce was often confused. According to Philostratus, *Heroicus*, 248 Boissonade, they cleansed the temple each day with water which they carried from the sea on their wings. Ammianus Marcellinus, xxii, 8, 34, speaks of the *candidas aves . . . halcyonis similes*. The island was uninhabited; few visited it and no one remained on it after dark without danger. The birds were the temple attendants. Rohde, *op. cit.* 372, considered them heroes, and Holland, *Heroenvogel in d. gr. Mythol.* 7 ff., looked upon them as servants of the light deity (*Dienerinnen der "Lichtgottheit"*). If they came to the island along with Iphigenia, they might be easier to explain.

Herodotus tells us that Iphigenia was the daughter of Agamemnon. According to another version Iphigenia is the daughter of Helen and Theseus, born after the return of Helen from captivity in Attica and brought up by Helen's sister Clytaemnestra (cf. Paus. ii, 22, 7). It is interesting that this version is used by Antoninus Liberalis, 27, who places Iphigenia on Leuce, as we have seen.

It must not be forgotten that according to some versions Helen herself was the wife of Achilles on Leuce. Pausanias, III, 19, 11, tells how Leonymus of Croton was sent to the island to be healed of a wound and how Helen ordered him to report to Stesichorus the cause of his blindness, an order which resulted in the famous palinode of the poet. At the same time Leonymus saw on the island the shades of many of the prominent heroes. Philostratus also places Helen on Leuce (*Her.* 246 B.).⁶ Miss Hirst, *op. cit.* XXII, 250, considers this merely an attempt to bring together the most beautiful woman and bravest man, but this may not be the entire explanation. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.* 263, groups Theseus and Helen for the same reason.

Helen is the daughter of the swan (Zeus), whether her mother be Leda (Eur. *Hel.* 20) or Nemesis (*Cypria*, frag. 6 Kinkel). Although she is never represented in Greek art as a swan, the egg-born woman might easily be connected with the Maiden, since she had bird relationships. The late legend that Helen and Menelaus were sacrificed by the Tauri and Iphigenia (Ptolemaeus Chennus, 189 Westermann) probably was due to a desire for literary justice, but it may be influenced by the common confusion of deity and victim.

Finally we must mention in connection with Leuce the murder of the last of the descendants of Priam by Achilles, when a merchant had carried her to the island and left her there by request of the hero (Philostr. *Her.* 254 f. B.). Is this another trace of the habit of human sacrifice?

Reference may be made also to the pinax preserved in the Louvre representing Artemis riding on a swan. Farnell, *op. cit.* II, 533, associates this with the cults of Delos and also with the journeys of Apollo to the Hyperboreans on a swan, but this connection leads us in most versions back to Scythia and still further to the north (cf. Hdt. IV, 33).

The Greek accounts of the Tauric Maiden are not at all definite in their descriptions of her real character. The

⁶ Notice also the winged boy Euphorion born to Achilles and Helen on Leuce (Ptol. Chen. 188 W.).

Greek custom of absorbing or neglecting foreign deities has completely civilized and naturalized this unknown goddess. The Maiden of the Chersonesus became a conventional Greek Artemis. Her influence extended, if we can equate Artemis and Iphigenia, for a considerable distance along the shore of the Black Sea, at least from the mouth of the Danube to the Don and the peninsula of Taman east of the Sea of Azov, where many earrings and pendants bearing the swan have been discovered (Minns, *op. cit.* 397). The cult was in existence at the time of the first Greek explorations, and the connection of Achilles with Leuce and perhaps with some goddess dates from the end of the eighth century B.C., the time of Arctinus of Miletus (Hirst, *op. cit.* 248). The cult continued among the Greeks until the fall of paganism, especially in Chersonesus.

This description of the Tauric Maiden as a barbaric goddess, possibly winged and connected with sea-birds, reminds us very strongly of the Swan-Maiden of the Slavs. Can we assume that this deity survived during a millennium and more without undue change? Is it likely that the folk migrations of the first millennium A.D. would leave undisturbed such a goddess?

South Russia has long been a natural passageway through which Asiatic invaders have sought to enter Europe, and this is as true today as in 2000 B.C. Despite this circumstance, the archaeological remains of South Russia show long periods of undisturbed development. Near Kiev and Poltava unbroken series can be found since the Neolithic Period. "The agricultural folk remained on the land, though they had to submit to aristocracies of warlike foreigners coming upon them alternately from the steppes to the southeast and from the forests and seas to the northwest" (Minns, *op. cit.* 193). Some of the excavations, as those at Zarubintsy, Chernyakhovo, and Pomashki, serve as links between the Scyths and the Slavs, and it may be said that the middle stretches of the Dniepr valley show a fairly steady culture. When the Slavonic language came in may

be uncertain, but the pictures of these peasants are strikingly similar to those of the present day (cf. Minns, *op. cit.* 46). The Neuri of Herodotus and possibly the Budini may be considered Slavs (Minns, *op. cit.* 105).

If it be assumed that the chief centres of the worship of the Swan-Maiden were near the shore of the Black Sea, we could easily explain the dislike which she aroused in the minds of the interior peoples. She may have been the deity of a ruling alien race or again she may have been connected with the Slavs and been hostile to the *druzhinas* of the princes, the stratum of population which the byliny especially concern (Keltuyala, *op. cit.* 360).

As we have seen, Leuce is at the mouth of the Danube, but the Ἀχιλλέως δρόμος lies at the mouth of the Dniepr, with Berezan, another island connected with Achilles, still further to the north. This is to be remembered in the interpretation of the following passage from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *de Administrando Imperio*, 9 (III, 77 Niebuhr), in which he describes the route by which the Russians came in contact with the Empire: μετὰ δὲ τὸ διελθεῖν τὸν τοσοῦτον τόπον τὴν νῆσον τὴν ἐπιλεγομένην ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος καταλαμβάνουσιν, ἐν ἣ νήσῳ καὶ τὰς θυσίας αὐτῶν ἐπιτελοῦσιν διὰ τὸ ἐκεῖσε ἴστασθαι παμμεγέθη δρυῖν. καὶ θύουσιν πετεινοὺς ζῶντας. πηγνύουσιν δὲ καὶ σαγίττας γυρόθεν, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ ψωμία καὶ κρέατα, καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἔχει ἕκαστος, ὡς τὸ ἔθος αὐτῶν ἐπικρατεῖ. ῥίπτουσι δὲ καὶ σκαρφία περὶ τῶν πετεινῶν, εἴτε σφάζαι αὐτοὺς εἴτε καὶ φαγεῖν εἴτε καὶ ζῶντας ἐάσειν. The island of St. Gregory is at the mouth of the Dniepr and is very close to the old islands of Achilles. It is possible that we have here to do with a cult of the oak, but the important position held by the birds suggests that we are dealing here with the Maiden and possibly with a martial deity such as Achilles who receives the arrows. This is the view taken by Rambaud, *op. cit.* 409, and if correct, it is a most important testimony as to the continuance of the cult of the Maiden near the mouth of the Dniepr.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus wrote in the middle of the

ninth century, and is thus almost contemporary with the oldest portions of the byliny. Fair Sun Vladimir ruled from 977 to 1015 and parts of the legends which are sung by the nameless bards are far older. We may therefore safely conclude that our oldest Slavonic sources for the Swan-Maiden are but little younger than the last of the Greek references to this deity on the north shore of the Black Sea.

It may be asked whether the Tauric Maiden and Artemis were originally one and the same deity. If we were able to connect Artemis definitely with the great goddess of Mycenaean and of Cretan civilization, we might be able to answer this question, since the Tripolye culture of South Russia seems to have certain similarities to Mycenaean civilization. Proceeding on this hypothesis, Miss Hirst, *op. cit.* XXIII, 29, conjectures that the same deity may have developed into the Tauric Maiden in the Euxine and the Artemis of Brauron in Greece. This is by no means impossible, but our knowledge of the cultural and religious changes caused in South Russia by Iranians, Tatars, etc., is still too slight to speak on such a point with certainty.

We may then in conclusion sketch briefly the history of this deity. When the Greeks first entered the Black Sea, they found on its northern shore the cult of the Swan-Maiden, a bird-goddess, probably winged like the 'Persian Artemis' and with bloodthirsty tastes. Her cult centred on the Tauric peninsula (the Crimea) and on the islands which bordered the coast to the westward. This deity was identified with Iphigenia and later with Artemis, and the name Iphigenia was used especially in reference to those sections of coast which had already been brought into connection with the heroes of the Trojan War, particularly Achilles. The cult was softened and Hellenized along the coast and died out along with the rest of paganism at the time of its conquest by Christianity. The interior tribes, never Hellenized, remembered her as an evil divinity but continued to worship her for several centuries more. Then she faded there, and as the Swan-Maiden, Marya the White Swan, she

gradually sank into the bylina tradition as a type of the unfaithful wife, the foe of Holy Russia, and in this new form she found new life during another millennium. We can therefore trace her history for nearly three millennia in Russia; and at the same time the Russian sources serve to throw considerable light upon the shadowy figure called by the Greeks the Tauric Maiden, Artemis, or Iphigenia.

V. — *Bellerophon's Tablet and the Homeric Question in the
Light of Oriental Research*

BY PROFESSOR NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

IN the sixth book of the *Iliad*, Diomedes, son of Tydeus, goes forth to fight in single combat with the unknown champion of Troy. The valiant but circumspect Greek is anxious to know first of all whether his antagonist is a god or a man. It is dangerous to attack a divine being, as had been seen in the case of Lycurgus, the Thracian king, who opposed the cult of Dionysus and in consequence was stricken with blindness and did not long survive. Glaucus the Lycian, however, assures Diomedes that he belongs to the mortal race that comes upon the scene and passes away like the leaves of the trees in the forest, and yet to a noble family whose history for many generations may be worthy of record. He is the son of Hippolochus whom Bellerophon begat with a Lycian princess. This Bellerophon himself was a grandson of Sisyphus, ruler of Ephyra, or Corinth. A fugitive at the court of Proetus, king of Tiryns, he virtuously resisted the blandishments of the queen, Antaea, who was desperately in love with him, and was therefore accused by her of an attempt to seduce her. Unwilling, for religious reasons, to follow her counsel and put his guest to death, Proetus sent Bellerophon to his father-in-law, the king of Lycia, called Iobates in a later tradition, with "dire signs, having written in a folded tablet many soul-destroying things, which he ordered him to show to his father-in-law in order that he might perish":

πέμπε δέ μιν Λυκίηνδε, πόρεν δ' ὃ γε σήματα λυγρὰ,
γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά·
δείξαι δ' ἠνώγειν ᾧ πενθερῷ, ὅφρ' ἀπόλοιτο. — *Il.* VI, 168 ff.

The Lycian king entertained him nine days, and on the tenth asked for the message he brought from Proetus.

When the "evil sign" (σῆμα κακόν) had been delivered, the king sent him on various dangerous errands. He was commanded to put to death the Chimaera, to kill the Solymians, to slay the Amazons, and to run the risk of an ambush placed in his way. By his success Bellerophon proved that he was of divine origin (θεοῦ γόνος), became the son-in-law of Iobates, and received half of his kingdom. Having heard this story, Diomedes declares that an ancient guest-friendship exists between Glaucus and himself, since Bellerophon had once been the honored guest of his grandfather Oeneus. He proposes that neither of them shall fight with the other as long as the war shall last, and exchanges weapons. That Diomedes gains by the exchange arms of gold for arms of bronze, the value of a hundred bulls for that of nine, is ascribed to the act of Zeus, depriving Glaucus of ordinary prudence in the moment of excitement.

The question of supreme interest in this delightful episode concerns the character of Bellerophon's tablet. What did the poet mean by σήματα λυγρά, θυμοφθόρα πολλά, γράψας, and πίναξ πτυκτός? Has the answer any bearing on the Homeric problem, and particularly on such important aspects of it as the age of the *Iliad* or the section containing this story, the knowledge and use of writing on the part of the author or authors, and the possible historic nucleus? And does our present measure of acquaintance with the period to which tradition ascribes the Trojan War, gained through Oriental sources, shed any light upon these questions?

There seems to be no allusion to Bellerophon's tablet in any Greek writer known to us before the Alexandrian period. Unfortunately, none of the papyri hitherto discovered contains the lines referring to it. The fragment preserved in *Oxyrhyncus Papyrus*, 445, begins with vi, 173. It is impossible, therefore, to know whether any copy circulating in Egypt lacked line 169, athetized by some modern diaskeuasts. From Eustathius, Apollonius, Apollodorus, and Codex Venetus we know that the great editors of Homer in Alexandria, Zenodotus of Ephesus, Aristophanes

of Byzantium, and Aristarchus of Samothrace, recognized the genuineness of the present text. The earliest comments on this text are those of Aristarchus, best preserved in the great Venetian codex published by Villoison, and more briefly in the lexical treatise of Apollonius. He maintains, apparently against Zenodotus, who seems to have insisted that letters (τῆς λέξεως γράμματα) must be meant, his conclusion that the words should not be so understood, but that γράψας is to be explained by ξέσαι, 'engrave, incise,' and that consequently Proetus traced images which his father-in-law would understand: ἡ διπλῇ, ὅτι ἔμφασίς ἐστι τοῖς τῆς λέξεως γράμμασι χρῆσθαι. οὐ δεῖ δὲ τοῦτο δέξασθαι. ἀλλ' ἔστι γράψαι τὸ ξέσαι. οἶον οὖν ἐγχαράξας εἰδῶλα δι' ὧν ἔδει γνῶναι τὸν πενθερὸν τοῦ Προίτου. Again (on line 178) he insists that "he says signs, not letters; he therefore engraved images": ἡ διπλῇ, ὅτι σημεία λέγει, οὐ γράμματα. εἰδῶλα ἄρα ἐνέγραψεν. It is natural that Aristarchus, who was familiar with the sight of Egyptian hieroglyphics, should have concluded that the poet thought of such signs. Whether or not he knew that a number of the Egyptian hieroglyphics had a fixed alphabetical value, he could not be ignorant of the fact that the εἰδῶλα, or images of men, beasts, birds, snakes, and other objects he saw on temple walls represented a system of writing by which it was possible to express whatever one wished. Such or similar signs may well have been employed by Proetus; but they were not γράμματα, not letters like those he used himself.

On the other hand, Apollodorus declares that Proetus gave to Bellerophon letters to bear to Iobates in which he had written to him to kill Bellerophon; and when Iobates had learned their contents he gave his orders to him: Προῖτος ἔδωκεν ἐπιστολὰς αὐτῷ πρὸς Ἰοβάτην κομίσειν, ἐν αἷς ἐνεγέγραπτο, Βελλεροφόντην ἀποκτείνειν. Ἰοβάτης δὲ ἐπιγνοὺς ἐπέταξεν (*Bibl.* II, 3, 1). Homer's words clearly conveyed to his mind the idea of a letter written in Greek characters. Wolf denied this (*Prolegomena*, 74), and brought forth as his strongest argument, capable of settling every doubt, the fact

that ἐπιγνῶναι means 'to know,' and not 'to read,' which is ἀναγνῶναι. This is, of course, correct, but altogether irrelevant. There is no reason why he should have used the one verb rather than the other. When Iobates had learned what Proetus wished him to know, he gave his commands. That he learned this through reading the letter is understood. It is not even necessary to suppose that Apollodorus desired to suggest that the letter was interpreted to him; he no doubt assumed that, if a letter was sent to the Lycian king by his son-in-law, he would be able to read it himself. In Athens there was nothing to lead one's thought to hieroglyphics.

As regards the folded tablet we have no comment that can with certainty be ascribed to the great Alexandrian critic. It is impossible to say whether any of the scholia collected by Eustathius in the twelfth century from such commentators as Apion, Herodorus, Demosthenes the Thracian, Porphyry, and others, go back to the schools of Aristarchus and Crates of Mallos. One of them gives an example of philosophical interpretation that reminds us of the latter; and there is a philological scholium not unworthy of the former. In this scholium the πίναξ is explained as a wooden tablet, σανίς or ξυλάριος, and the πτυκτός is referred to a custom of joining two boards together. But πτυκτός is also used of tablets of brass or of stone. The πίναξ is further supposed to be like a δέλτος or δελτίον, so named because it is triangular and in the shape of the letter delta. Of special interest is the remark that the ancient Greeks, like the Egyptians and in later times the Scythians, used animal forms and other characters as hieroglyphics which could be read to express whatever they wished, engraving them on wooden tablets. Pliny, *H. N.* XIII, 20, mentions the use of *pugillares*, or thin pieces of wood, before the Trojan War, and declares that Bellerophon was given such *codicilli* (*i.e. pugillares*) and not *epistolae*.

The allusion of Cicero, *de Or.* III, 137, to the work of Pisistratus in arranging the disordered books of Homer, that of Aelian, *V.H.* XIII, 14, to his bringing the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*

together in their present form, and of Pausanias, vii, 26, to his collecting the verses of Homer, but above all the statement of Josephus, *contra Apionem*, i, 2, that, according to a widely prevalent and probable opinion, the Greeks did not use their letters at the time of the Trojan War, and that there were even those who said that Homer did not leave his poems in writing, but their memory was preserved in song, and they were put together afterward, — all these could not help exercising a profound influence on later scholars. Perizonius, *Animadversiones historicae* (1684), drew the conclusion from Aelian and Josephus that the art of writing became known long after Homer's time, the songs were preserved orally, and Pisistratus brought them together. François Hedelin Abbé d'Aubignac in 1715 added the thought that Homer may never have existed. He is greeted as the "father of Homeric criticism" by Finsler, *Homer in der Neuzeit* (1912). Giovanni Battista Vico, *Principi di scienza nuova* (1726), likewise denied the historical existence of Homer, and made Pisistratus the collector and publisher. Blackwell, *Inquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer* (1735, 3d ed. 1757), and Robert Wood, *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer* (1769), following the same line of thought, are obliged to look upon Bellerophon's tablet as proving that Homer's time knew no writing, but only symbolical or pictographic representations. Jean Jacques Rousseau, *Sur l'origine des langues* (1782), expressed the conviction that the whole section dealing with Glaucus and Diomedes was an interpolation, on account of the allusion to the tablet and the consequent knowledge of writing before the Trojan War. Antoine Goguet, *De l'origine des lois* (1758), was at least certain that the heroes did not know the art of writing, so that the signs on Proetus' tablet could only be hieroglyphics.

The leading factors in the argument of F. A. Wolf, *Prolegomena ad Homerum* (1795) — ignorance of writing in the age of Homer, oral transmission and gradual growth of the poems, and committal to writing for the first time by Pisistratus — had already been reached by a number of men. In

regard to Bellerophon, Wolf looked upon the signs as hieroglyphics, symbols, cut into a sealed wooden tablet. There was little that was new in the *Prolegomena*, but the mastery of the material, the distinctness of the views, and the fascinating style made a strong and lasting impression. Some of his followers went beyond him, both in respect to the fundamental questions and with reference to the Bellerophon passage, in the interpretation of which the general attitude is so apt to express itself. Bothe (1832), Crusius (1857), Arnold (1864), and many others suggested that the carved symbols in the wooden tablet might be such as Proetus and Iobates had secretly agreed upon using; Grote still in 1862 regarded the incised symbols on Bellerophon's tablet as the best evidence that the art of writing was unknown in the Greek world before the sixth century.

Especially in the last generation there has been a marked reaction against the position of Wolf and his school, caused chiefly by the results of the excavations in Greece, Troy, and Crete. The idea of cryptographical, symbolical, esoteric signs has been wholly abandoned. Nor does the view of Apollodorus, followed by many others down to recent times, find any important defender at present. Though we have some inscriptions that go back to about 700 B.C., and references in Greek sources that need not be doubted to inscriptions almost a century older, a suggestion that the Greek alphabet was in use before the Trojan War is not readily entertained. Even those who, like Vigilio Inama, *Omero nell' età micenea* (Milan, 1913), would place the poet at the end of the Mycenaean Age, about 1100 B.C., and make him write his masterpieces then in the Achaean dialect, do not think of his using the Greek alphabet, but rather some script of the same nature as those found in Crete. It is the interpretation of Aristarchus which in a modified form is gaining the assent of scholars. While Paley in 1866 still spoke of "some kind of a writing," Stier in 1886 suggested the Cypriote syllabic script, Leaf in 1900 thought of a Cretan script, and so Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age* (1909), and Van

Leeuwen in his great edition of 1912. What with thousands of inscriptions found in Crete, hundreds in Cyprus, and a considerable number in Mycenae in the Peloponnesus, Menidhi in Attica, and Orchomenus on Lake Copais in Boeotia, it is not difficult to accept the verdict of Van Leeuwen: "ars scribendi in Graecia saeculis aliquot — fortasse multis — ante poetarum illorum aetatem fuit cognita."

But the question never seems to have been raised whether our recent discoveries in the East, so eagerly exploited to help in the decision as to the *σήματα*, may not also throw some light upon the *πίναξ πτυκτός*. The double tablet of wood figures in all discussions. It has not been thought necessary to inquire what kind of tablets were actually used in the thirteenth century B.C. in the lands around the Eastern Mediterranean. Has not a scholiast informed us that what he called a *δέλτος* or *δελτίον* was called by Homer a *πίναξ*, and that such wooden *πίνακες* were used in ancient times by Greeks as well as by Egyptians and Scythians? All the world knows the story told by Herodotus of Demaretus who sent from Susa a *πίναξ πτυκτός* (*duplicata tabella*) to the Lacedaemonians, revealing the plan of Xerxes, and how he scraped off the wax, inscribed the tablet, and then covered the text with wax again so that the bearer of the nude tablet might not be molested by the guards (VII, 239). There seemed to be room only for a difference of opinion as to whether or not Proetus waxed his *pugillares*.

But there is a startling fact that deserves serious consideration. In the centuries immediately preceding the traditional date of the Trojan War, thousands of tablets containing written messages were sent from place to place, from land to land. But they were not wooden tablets; they were clay tablets. Not only did swift messengers speed with these tablets of clay from city to city in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris, and between Elam, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Gutium, and Assyria, but between Egypt and the Syrian dynasts, Cyprus, Mitani, and Arzawi, between Hatti, the capital of the Hittites in Asia Minor, and their Amoritish

vassals in Syria, and between the same capital and the rulers of Mesopotamia, Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt. In Crete, where various scripts were used, one hieroglyphic and another linear, as well as also the clearly Philistine script of the Phaestus disk, the clay tablet was apparently the favorite form of a letter or document, while wooden tablets, with or without wax, do not seem to have been used. If a tablet is referred to in the Mycenaean Age, the presumption is overwhelmingly in favor of a clay tablet. Now what would a *πίναξ πτυκτός* be in that age? Even this question may be answered today. In every large collection of cuneiform tablets, and in many small ones, there are *duplicatae tabellae*. Those at Cornell come from the Hammurapi period. They are, for the most part, legal or business documents. First a tablet was inscribed with the original draft, then after it had been dried in the sun—it is scarcely to be assumed that it was baked—another lump of soft clay was folded over it, and a duplicate of the original text, or a summary of it, was inscribed. Of still greater importance is the fact that many such folded tablets have on the outside only the name and address of the person to whom the communication is directed. They are sealed and addressed letters, and the outer covering serves as an envelope. Such tablets exist in the museum of the University of Pennsylvania, according to the testimony of Mr. Chiera. This is the only *πίναξ πτυκτός* that seems to have been in use in the Near East in the period preceding the Trojan War.

Is it likely that this double tablet of clay could have found its way to Lycia and the Peloponnesus? The world that used the cuneiform script as well as the clay tablet drew near to Lycia and the Aegean at various times. Thus the Cappadocian tablets show us that as early as the middle of the third millennium B.C. Assyria had pushed her way into Asia Minor, how far west we cannot tell. At Boghaz-keui the Hittite Empire reveals the strong influence of Babylonia in the adoption for certain purposes of the cuneiform writing and even the Babylonian language. How far towards the

southwest corner of Asia Minor this Hittite Empire spread its power cannot yet be determined. But it is evident that Lycia could be reached from this direction. Again, Babylonian speech and script went into Egypt, as the Tell el Amarna correspondence shows. On the other hand, the Lycians and the Achaeans of the Peloponnesus were participants in raids that brought them to Egypt and elsewhere. In the first part of the fourteenth century the Lukki, or Lycians, appear in the Amarna tablets; in the reign of Ramses II (c. 1310-1244) the Lukiu appear with the Dardanians, Ionians (Yawana), Cilicians, Pedasians, and possibly Mysians; in the time of Mer en Ptah (c. 1244-1232) the Lycians appear with the Etruscans (Tursha), Sardinians (Shardani), Achaeans (Akaiwasha), and Sikeli (Shakalisha). Neither Lycians nor Achaeans are mentioned in the time of Ramses III (c. 1204-1169), when Philistines, Sicilians, Sardinians, and probably Danai, Teucrians, and Oscans are referred to as invading Egypt. It may not be without significance that they were not taking part in the raid on Egypt, if at that very time they were fighting about the walls of Troy. Half a century before, the Lycians had fought side by side with Ionians and Dardanians in one expedition, and with Achaeans in another.

In view of these references to the Lycians in trustworthy historic sources Beloch's theory (*Griechische Geschichte*² [1912], I, 1, 184) that the epic gives to the Termilae and their land mythical names meaning 'light-bringers' and 'land of light' lacks all foundation. It is possible that the Lycians came to the high plateau of Milyas and the banks of the Xanthus from Crete, as Herodotus states (I, 73; VII, 92), but also that this tradition represents the memory of a return of Lycians to Asia Minor after an attempt to settle in Crete. A similar effort on the part of Danai to establish themselves in Egypt seems to have given rise to the story of the Danaides. Whether the whole people once lived in Crete or an important colony returned from there after a more or less prolonged stay, Lycians would have gained

familiarity with writing and with the use of clay tablets. The Achaeans and the Ionians may have sent colonies to Asia Minor long before the twelfth century, as Eduard Meyer suggests. This would account for their union with Dardanians and Lycians in the expeditions against Egypt, and the early appearance of the name Ionians (Yawana) which spread to all eastern nations. The story of Bellerophon may reflect the consciousness of a foreign Achaean strain in the population of Lycia, and the services rendered by this Achaean element in subduing the Solymians, an earlier people driven into the mountains. Perhaps the chief channel through which Babylonian and Assyrian influence may have come to the Lycians was the neighboring Hittite Empire. In the beginning of the twelfth century three great empires seem to have collapsed, the Egyptian, the Hittite, and the Minoan. Fifty years earlier they still maintained their political power, as the Boghaz-keui letters and the Egyptian accounts show, and the archaeological evidence in Crete appears to indicate. Movements of population, war-like expeditions, and colonizations were obviously among the causes of this momentous change.

There is a disposition today on all sides to place among the historic events of that period the siege of Troy, the great struggle between the king of Mycenae and his allies in Greece on the one hand and the king of the Trojans and his allies in Asia Minor on the other. Among the latter allies were the Lycians. No improbability attaches to the sending of a letter by an Achaean king to his kinsman, the king of Lycia, two generations before the Trojan War. The very fact that it is called a "folded tablet" adds to the plausibility. Whether the story has any basis in historic fact is another matter. The presence of the Chimaera and the Amazons warns us that Bellerophon may indeed be of divine origin (*θεοῦ γένος*). But this would not show that the Solymians also belong to the realm of myth, or that a Lycian warrior in the Trojan camp may not have had Greek blood in his veins. There are critics who believe that Priam is the actual

name of the king of Troy, while Agamemnon is a god. Perhaps they are right. The mythical and the historical are often within elbow touch of each other. Arta Hipa of Jerusalem who begs Ikh-n-Aton for help and troops is a historic personage. Does Melchizedek of Salem, who gives tithes to Abram the Hebrew, also belong to history? The story of Micah's shrine in Mount Ephraim may be true in every detail, and yet Samson be nothing but a solar hero.

If the story of Bellerophon's tablet is read in the light of conditions we now know to have existed at the end of the Mycenaean Age, a puzzling question arises. How could a communication, so foreign to a later time, in a strange system of writing, on a material not used in subsequent periods, and handled in a most peculiar manner, become known to the poet? What could have led him to tell the tale in this fashion? To suppose that he invented it with his own imagination implies too heavy a strain on ours. It would be little short of miraculous, if, as some still think, the art of writing was wholly unknown to him. This, however, may be regarded as an exploded notion. Whether or not he knew how to write himself, Greeks had known how to express their thoughts in writing centuries before he composed his songs. He does not indeed mention writing anywhere else. Why should he be expected to do so? A careful perusal of such works as Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Vergil's *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Silius' *Punica*, Statius' *Thebaid*, Tasso's *Gerusalemme liberata*, Camoens' *Lusiadas*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the *Mahabharata*, the *Ramayana*, the *Kalevala*, with a view to discovering allusions to writing, brings home the conviction that epic poets, excogitating their verses, pen in hand, very rarely think of mentioning the gentle art they so constantly practise. There may not have been any conscious avoidance on the part of Homer. He had no occasion elsewhere to refer to writing. Van Leeuwen well answers those who express a surprise that a Homer familiar with writing should not have seen to it that some letters were sent from Troy to Peloponnesus, by asking

why an illiterate Homer should not have sent messengers with oral greetings. The strangeness of touch every critic has felt in VI, 168 ff. is not at all likely to be due to an unlettered man's awkwardness in describing a thing he does not know, but rather to the difficulty in presenting a process no longer used and not easily imagined. The farther the poet is from the time whose customs he depicts, the fainter becomes the survival of these customs in memory.

In estimating the time when a poet could have written a great work like the *Iliad*, the mistake has usually been made of relying solely on epigraphic material. This is done not only by Wolf and his followers but also by their opponents. Granted that we have no inscriptions earlier than 700 B.C. and no reliable testimony concerning any inscriptions earlier than the first Olympiad, does this show conclusively that writing cannot have flourished before that time, even in the same alphabet? By no means. The earliest Hebrew inscriptions we have are those on jars belonging apparently to king Ahab (c. 872-853); and if the doubtful Hiram and Jeroboam inscriptions are left out, the Ahab inscriptions are older than any written in the North Semitic alphabet, such as the inscriptions of Mesha', Kilamu, and Zakir. Yet alphabetic writing was used for all kinds of purposes centuries before Ahab's time. Bellerophon's tablet has often been called a Uriah letter. The letter that sent Uriah the Hittite to his death was dispatched by David, whose reign can scarcely be later than about 1033-993. This letter was written toward the end of the eleventh century. More important, however, is the fact that it is referred to in a historic document of very remarkable character, namely, II Sam. 9-20, I Kings, 1-2. It is recognized practically by all critics that this account of David's life in Jerusalem was written by a contemporary. Some have gone so far as to ascribe it to a definite person, such as Ahimaaz or Abiathar. It is an extraordinarily fine piece of historic writing, sympathetic and respectful in demeanor, yet objective and fearless in its statement of facts, free from long speeches and miraculous tales,

yet of sufficient epic breadth, full of pathos, earnestness, and sincerity. Eduard Meyer, a good judge in such matters, has paid an eloquent and just tribute to this historical writer who composed his work about 1000 B.C. And this book, respectable in size, appearing more than a century before our earliest dateable Hebrew inscription, is written in prose, excellent prose! The material may have been tanned skins of sheep or goats or papyrus. Zakar Baal of Byblos (c. 1100 B.C.) receives from Egypt papyrus rolls, and "the journal of his fathers" was probably written on such, one would like to know in what script. When the Songs of Conquest (Num. 21), which may go back to the fifteenth century, and the Song of Deborah (c. 1250 B.C.) were committed to writing cannot be determined. The present writer has long believed that the Semitic alphabet was developed in Palestine from signs the Philistines brought with them from Crete in two forms, the northern and the southern. In that case, the invention cannot be earlier than 1200 B.C. (cf. my article "Alphabet" in the *New International Encyclopaedia*², 1914). The possibility, however, must be reckoned with that the alphabet is of Canaanitish origin, and that the Philistines dropped their own script and adopted it when they settled in the land afterwards named after them.

In view of this condition in Syria, we may well ask ourselves whether something similar did not take place in Greece and on the coasts of the Aegean. Here, too, there is likely to have been much literary activity before the date of the earliest inscriptions that accidentally have become known to us. Judging from the Palestinian analogy, it would not be in the least hazardous to assume that a poet living in Smyrna in the middle of the ninth century could have written any poem he was able to compose. In fact, it is the length, and not the shortness, of the distance that separates Herodotus' date for Homer (c. 850) from Eratosthenes' date for the Trojan War (1184 B.C.) or that of the Paris marble (1206), which makes the thoughtful student pause. The poet obviously looks back to a past time, he is not describing his own;

and Inama's attempt to locate him in the beginning of the eleventh century is not convincing. At the same time the poet is not a learned archaeologist and least of all a modern artist with a cultivated historic sense, careful of preserving the color of place and time. How could he then look through three centuries and a half and see so clearly the condition of things at the end of the Mycenaean Age, which excavations and inscriptions of other peoples have presented to us? Two answers are possible. Herodotus may be wrong, and Homer may have lived long before the ninth century. Or Homer may have used earlier sources. The latter seems the more probable view. Some of these may have come down by oral transmission; others may have been accessible to him in written form. It is also to be remembered that there probably was no such abrupt break between the two periods as has been imagined. Much no doubt survived in the ninth century which seems to us peculiar to the Mycenaean Age. To some extent that may be true even of the *πίναξ πτυκτός*. Clay tablets were used in Palestine, as the excavations have shown, possibly as late as the seventh century, though as yet we have no evidence of the Hebrew language or the Semitic alphabet being used in them. So in Asia Minor and in Greece these tablets may not for some time have given place to the wooden *δελτίον* of the fifth century.

If the *Iliad* is essentially the work of Homer, as distinguished specialists are beginning again to believe, it is of course possible that it has suffered greatly in transmission, in spite of the preservative influence of the hexameter, which could never be lost sight of as has been the case with the meter of Hebrew poetry to the serious damage of the text. There may, no doubt, be many interpolations. Rousseau's suggestion, quoted with approval by Wolf, that the whole episode of Glaucus and Diomedes is such an interpolation, has already been mentioned. His reason was Homer's supposed ignorance of writing. The reference in the episode to the Dionysus cult (130 ff.) has since been noticed as a mark of late date. In this instance, however, it is in Thrace,

not in Greece, that the Dionysiac cult is celebrated and the unsuccessful attempt is made to repudiate it; and it is the danger of fighting a foreign, not a Greek, divinity that is cited in justification of Diomedes' unwillingness to run the risk of a combat with a Lycian god. It must be admitted that his anxiety, on this occasion, not to fight with a god is inconsistent with his previous battles with gods. But just as the inconsistencies between the Ship Catalogue and the Doloneia (especially x, 428 ff.), pointed out by Niese, *Der homerische Schiffskatalog* (1873), 50 f., are of far less importance than the external testimony of the Egyptian inscriptions to a sort of federation, or at least concerted action, of the very peoples mentioned as the allies of Troy, so the references to Lycians and Achaeans in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries and the natural interpretation of Bellerophon's tablet would seem to weigh more than such petty inconcinnities as may well have escaped the notice of the poet himself — *si quandoque dormitat pater Homerus*.

VI. — *Prudentius and Christian Humanism*

BY PROFESSOR EDWARD KENNARD RAND

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE fourth century of our era was one of the most splendid and momentous epochs in European civilization. It witnessed the triumph of a new faith, which, necessarily rejecting what seemed false and harmful in ancient culture, retained its better elements as a vital part of a liberal education. This programme of a new and Christian humanism is first proclaimed by Lactantius. He did not invent the idea; it is implicitly recognized by St. Clement of Alexandria, Minucius Felix, and others, who descend in a golden and apostolic succession from St. Paul and are chronicled in the seventieth letter of St. Jerome. But Lactantius' *Divinae Institutiones*, a title that we might translate, *The Principles of Christian Education*, has the value of a systematic utterance and a standard work. The principles which he there sets forth do not differ essentially from those to which Cicero, one of the best educated men in human history, had subscribed, save that the queen of the arts and sciences is no longer human philosophy, but divine; trivium and quadrivium, centering about the study of the great authors of the past, train the mind to its highest exercise, philosophic reasoning, but reasoning about the data of a revelation. This programme of Christian humanism, with inevitable ups and downs and the inevitably different emphases of different temperaments, became the controlling principle of education; with new modifications and temporary eclipses, it traversed the following ages, down into our own times, when it lost its religious character and encountered the elective system. It were rash to prophesy its future. I am concerned with the Christian humanism established in the fourth century, regarding it as a reasonable and vital movement, essaying a middle course between the mutually opposing criticisms levelled against the

period, the one in behalf of Neo-Paganism by Gibbon, and the other in behalf of Neo-Montanism by the good Dean Merivale. I look with sympathy on the attempt of the Church to guard its peculiar treasure with zeal, but to treasure no less devoutly its heritage in the culture of the past.

Prudentius is far and away the best exponent of the Christian humanism of the fourth century, so far as it is expressed in poetry. He is an artist, a careful student of style, but he is also, in an original and highly skilful fashion, an apologist of Christianity. There is always this twofold aspect of his work.

Our poet was born in Spain in the year 348. In 405, when he was fifty-seven years old, he prepared an edition of his poems, with a brief preface. In this we learn of his previous career of law and statesmanship. His life falls into two parts, the one devoted to *negotium*, the other relaxed in *otium* — that lost and blessed art of uninterrupted and congenial toil. His works were written, apparently, in quick succession, and he did not long survive their final publication. He died about the year 410.

There is obviously an aesthetic, or logical, purpose in the arrangement of Prudentius' works, as he describes them in his preface, but in discussing them I shall not adhere to this order, or to any assumed chronological scheme. I begin with two poems often misjudged, particularly by those who, repelled by the titles, have not read them. *Apotheosis* and *Hamartigeneia*, 'The Nature of the Holy Trinity' and 'The Nature of Original Sin' — who would be tempted to read further than these announcements of the poet's theme? But the headings *de Rerum Natura* and *Georgicon Libri* are quite as prosaic, and yet magnificent poetry lies just beyond them. Perhaps the prosaically named poems of Prudentius contain surprises for the reader who persists to their end. He will learn, first of all, that the *Apotheosis* is not primarily an exposition of an abstruse theological doctrine. Aimé Puech, the author of an excellent book on our poet, is, curiously, one of those who

have erred in the interpretation of this work. Starting with the idea that the subject is the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, he wonders¹ that among the heresies discussed that of Arius is given no mention, and concludes that Prudentius warily avoided controversies not thoroughly aired in the West or definitely adjudged by the Church. But surely, at the end of the fourth century, the Church had made up its mind about Arius; our poet had heard too much rather than too little about him. He is sufficiently damnatory of Arius in another poem (*Psych.* 794), but here his endeavor is not to settle the question of the Holy Trinity. The heresies discussed bear primarily on another matter, the real subject of the poem, which is indicated in the title, *Apotheosis*. It is deification — the deification of all human nature in the Incarnation of our Lord. The *Hamartigeneia*, in contrast, treats of the origin of evil and the degeneration of human kind. The two works are companion pieces, forming a kind of *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained*. Their theological titles cover a multitude of topics familiar to the reader of Lucretius — the nature of the soul, the question of its immortality, the creation of the world, the freedom of the will, the descent of man, and the corruption of nature. To the contemporaries of Prudentius, these works must have come, to borrow a phrase of Thamin's,² as an intellectual *coup d'état*. For the first time, the inner mysteries of the faith were proclaimed by a Christian Lucretius. The style of this new poetry is Virgilian rather than Lucretian. I am not speaking of direct appropriations, which have all been duly collected,³ and which do not bulk large, but of the flavor of Prudentius' verse. He has not the magic touch of Virgil, but he has mastered the art of the Virgilian hexameter with more delicacy than those martial and resonant singers, Juvenal, Lucan, and

¹ *Prudence, Étude sur la poésie latine chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (1888), 173 f.

² R. Thamin, *St. Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (1895), 1. He is speaking of the *de Officiis Ministrorum*.

³ See F. S. Drexel, *Des Prudentius Verhältnis zu Vergil*, 1907; E. B. Lease, *A Syntactic, Stilistic and Metrical Study of Prudentius* (1895), 66 ff.

Claudian. Without the strength and the sublimity of Lucretius, he has evened off the crudities of Lucretius' splendidly archaic verse. Manilius achieved a similar polish, but has nothing of Prudentius' originality of thought or expression. Prudentius has his faults, the chief of which is an occasional lapse into bad taste. A writer who in telling of the miracle of the loaves and fishes can describe the multitude as sated *to the point of indigestion* (*Apoth.* 719), can hardly hope for the epic spirit or the grand style. But the poems as a whole are Lucretian in matter and Virgilian in form. Biblical simplicity is arrayed in the splendors of the ancient rhetoric, with prevailingly good taste. The land flowing with milk and honey becomes (*Hamart.* 478)

solum, cui melle perenni
Glaeba fluens niveos permiscet lactea rivos, —

verses of which Virgil himself would not have been ashamed. And when Prudentius wishes to pay poetical homage to the name of Christ, it is to Virgil's mastery of repetition and emphatic order that he turns, as Dante did,⁴ for a pattern:

Christus forma Patris, nos *Christi* forma et imago,
Condimur in faciem Domini bonitate paterna,
Venturo in nostram faciem post saecula *Christi*.

In another way these poems suggest both Lucretius and Virgil. Dryden remarks that Virgil, had he chosen, could have been the foremost writer of satire among the Romans; the remark is true, unless it be more justly applied to Lucretius. They both, at any rate, are masters of satire of one variety — not Horace's pleasant picture of human foibles or Juvenal's lashing of human vice, but splendid outbursts of moral satire as intense as Juvenal's though of an incomparably greater art. Prudentius is allied in kind, though not in degree, with Virgil and Lucretius rather than with Juvenal. We begin with a theological theme, pass into phi-

⁴ *Apoth.* 309. Cf. Dante, *Purg.* 30, 49 with Virgil, *Geor.* iv, 525.

losophy, and before we know it, we are reading a Lucretian indictment of the vanity of human achievements or a Virgilian encomium of the simple life. I would not deny a bit of Juvenal now and then — at least there is the inevitable ex-coriation of poor woman. Mother Eve did not foresee that she would reach the age of Prudentius laden not only with the primal transgression of Eden, but with all the iniquities of Juvenal's sixth satire.

In his tributes to the Martyrs, the *Peristephanon*, Prudentius employs, with ease and not infrequently with grace, various metres of Horace, including strophæic combinations of the more difficult sorts. We thus have a new Prudentius here; he is a Christian Horace as well as a Christian Virgil and Lucretius. Moreover, we discover two moods in these poems, two styles displayed. One, which we should expect from the author of the *Apotheosis* and the *Hamartigeneia*, is a classic treatment of the legend in a complicated metre. The other style is utterly simple. Prudentius, using metres that suggest our ballad forms, brushes aside all gorgeousness and lets the story of a sainted life and a martyr's death shine in its own light. At the end of one of the best of the poems, that on the martyrdom of St. Lawrence, we find a little prayer (2, 581 ff.). In it Prudentius applies an epithet to himself that at first startles and then enlightens us. "Audi poetam rusticum," he says. Now the master of all the measures of the *Peristephanon* is no rustic, but, as the great Bentley called him, the Horace and the Virgil of the Christians. A topic that somebody could profitably follow down the centuries is 'Christian simplicity, real and assumed.' There is nothing false about Prudentius' simplicity here. For the moment he is rustic, consciously writing a simple ballad for simple folk to understand. But humility became as necessary a part of a Christian preface as politeness is of a French 'yours truly.' There is an interesting stream of tradition here, with numerous tributaries to explore.

I am not one of those who think that Prudentius' classic

efforts are an unfortunate *tour de force* and that his best work is in the humble Christian style. He does exceedingly good things in both styles. In the latter, you can sometimes say of him, "non Christianus sed Catullianus"; he has Catullus' lightness and grace and command of delightful diminutives. Ovid is another author whose spirit our versatile poet could catch. The poem on St. Hippolytus (*Peristeph.* 11) might have come, *mutatis mutandis*, from the *Fasti*. It is a half-heathen performance, especially the merry description of the festival of the saint (vss. 195 ff.). In *Peristeph.* 12 the festival of SS. Peter and Paul is similarly treated. Prudentius is merely putting into a literary form the genial attitude of the Church towards the fine old rites and *festas* of the Roman worship.

Of all the inventions of our poet, his transformation of the hymn is, to my mind, the most striking. St. Ambrose's hymns, while admirably adapted to their immediate and controversial end, are incidentally lyrics of crystalline simplicity and sincerity — Hyblaeian, as the poet Arator⁵ called them. Except for the iambic metre, there are few suggestions in them of classical models. They are perfect after their kind, and summon the imitator to despair. But Prudentius entered the lists, and it was not his nature to do the same thing twice. He calls his little collection *Cathemerinon*; broader than its title, it includes hymns not only for the canonical hours of the day, but for solemn festivals of the year and for the last rites of man's life. We see at once from their length that they never were intended for use in the liturgy. At least, if a modern clergyman gave out Hymn No. 7, which has two hundred and twenty verses, he would mitigate the announcement by adding, "the first two and the last two stanzas." We next notice the metres. Some are of the simple sorts, and some are exceedingly ornate. For the funeral march in the

⁵ *Epist. ad Parthenium*, 45:

Qualis in Hyblaeis Ambrosius eminent hymnis
Quos positi cunis significastis apes.

hymn for the dead (*Cath.* 10), Prudentius has anapaests. One hymn is daringly done in anacreontics; it is the hymn before sleep (*Cath.* 6), whereas anacreontics suggest a festivity that lasts all night. In short, this is the same Prudentius that we have learned in the *Peristephanon*; he is master of two kinds of art, the simple and the elaborate.

We can best appreciate the nature of Prudentius' hymns by comparing them with those of St. Ambrose. St. Ambrose wrote a hymn — *Aeterne rerum conditor* — for lauds, the daily service at cock-crow; and so did Prudentius (*Cath.* 1). The former is one of the familiar hymns of the breviary, and possesses the virtues that I have already described. Prudentius begins in an Ambrosian way, but soon passes into something allegorical. Chanticleer becomes a symbol of Christ, the poet says, just as our sleep is but an image of death. Now Ambrose, who in his prose works frequently indulged in allegory, also has a touch of it here; but it is merely an incidental coloring; he is writing with a service in mind. Prudentius, apparently with the whole morning before him, is giving us a learned exposition — the kind of material that would go into one of the good bishop's sermons. In proof of the divine power of the cock, Prudentius continues, "'tis said that it can put wandering demons to flight." "'Tis said" — now nobody says "'tis said" in a hymn. It is good for epic; it is good for the lighter sorts of narrative. In a hymn, we give thanks and offer prayers and take things for granted. Nor in a hymn do we give reasons and inferences, as Prudentius proceeds to do, inserting particles like *nam*, *namque*, *inde est quod*, and *nempe*. Then he introduces the mention of St. Peter, as Ambrose does, only again in a different way, with the flavor of an *exemplum* in a sermon or in certain kinds of ancient and mediaeval poetry, but not that of a hymn. It was at cock-crow, Prudentius proceeds, that Christ returned from the harrowing of hell, which he subjected to his own law. So we should subdue the hell of our vices, which make up the night of our souls, and we should

sweep from our vision those false dreams that so easily beset us — the dreams of gold and pleasure and power and honor and prosperity, those phantoms that blind us to reality. With Christ's help, we can quickly bid them be gone. "Do thou, oh Christ, dispel our sleep":

Tu Christe somnum dissice,
Tu rumpe noctis vincula,
Tu solve peccatum vetus
Novumque lumeningere.

Here, of a sudden, at the end of the poem, we have the simplicity of an Ambrosian hymn. It might all have had this character, had its author so chosen. But it is not so much a hymn as a poem of reflection — in which description, narrative, and allegorical exposition are all germane — written for a moment of the day when a hymn would be appropriate. The poet allegorizes the moment, he shows its moral significance, he calls up a typical example, and finally, he lets us hear the echo of the hymn itself, as though it stole in from the chapel near-by. It is almost as though the poet preferred to keep to his couch and ponder on the sacred meaning of the moment, instead of arising and taking part in the service.

A very beautiful hymn, which shows the same method, is that for candlelight (*Cath.* 5). The poet begins with an invocation to the Father of lights, and prays for the light of Christ to illumine the faithful. He thanks Him not only for the luminaries in the sky, but for the light that man himself can make with a spark from a flint. He sees the lamps lit one by one, and muses on the meaning of the marvel. Surely fire is of heavenly origin; it comes from God. That we see from the story of Moses and the burning bush. This sets him to thinking of all the glorious deeds that Moses wrought for the children of Israel. He describes the escape from Egypt, the wandering in the wilderness, and the entry into the Promised Land. The story is full of allegory, and portends the deeds of Christ, and the unwonted light that shone in hell when He

descended there before His resurrection. That is why we light our candles at Easter, so many of them that the ceiling looks like the starry firmament. Light is a worthy offering to thee, O God, for it is the most precious of thy gifts to us. The time has come in this poem for Prudentius to break into his own hymn; it is the lyric moment, to which he has been leading up:

Tu lux vera oculis, lux quoque sensibus,
Intus tu speculum, tu speculum foris,
Lumen quod famulans offero, suscipe
Tinctum pacifici chrismatis unguine.

This light that the poet offers is his own life, fragrant with the ointment of his baptism.

We do not read far in these novel hymns before feeling that somehow they are not so new. Though the substance is Christian, there is something indefinably pagan about them. All of a sudden, the Muse is invoked (*Cath.* 3, 26); she is exhorted to spurn her wonted ivy and weave mystic garlands of simple verse. Or take the opening strophe of the "Hymn at Candlelight":

Inventor rutili, *dux bone*, luminis,
Qui certis vicibus tempora dividis,
Merso sole chaos ingruit horridum,
Lucem redde tuis Christe fidelibus.

The first and the last line repeat Horace's appeal to the absent Augustus⁶ — *lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae*. This is not a comparison of our Lord to Augustus, but it hovers dangerously near that possibility. It shows the lengths that Prudentius is willing to go in his pagan flavors. So in the account of the harrowing of hell (*Cath.* 5, 125), we find that the river Styx is still flowing below, and that our Lord returns from "Acheruntian pools." Moreover, these hymns are *in their entire framework* pagan. They suggest Pindar, who will

⁶ *Carm.* IV, 5, 5. See H. Breidt, *De Aurelio Prudentio Clemente Horati imitatore* (1887), 26.

begin a hymn with an invocation, tell a myth to illustrate a point or honor the god, and pass on into the general and the ideal. I am not sure that Prudentius knew Pindar, but we can find in Horace, who did, plenty of examples of briefer compass but identical character. Take, for instance, the ode on poetry (III, 4). It begins with a prayer for inspiration and then tells the myth, the story of the sleeping boy, covered with leaves by the woodland doves. Thus the Muses protect the poet, they protect the state, and the gods themselves are sovereign because of poetry, the higher intelligence; the Giants, symbols of brute strength, fell before them:

Vis consili expers mole ruit sua.

There is a touch of Prudentian allegory in this ode of Horace.

Prudentius, then, is not writing hymns for the liturgy of the Church, but is filling the framework of Pindaric and Horatian hymns with Christian feeling and belief and Christian story. He is showing that the new faith has a wealth of material just as poetic as the facts and fables of ancient tradition. Yet his purpose is not to supersede pagan culture, but to include it. The culture represented by Prudentius' hymns and which he passed on to the coming generations, cannot dispense with the ancient authors who had contributed to its making.

In this finely pagan performance, there are, we saw, exquisite bits of the simplest and sweetest sort, worthy of a place beside those Hyblæan hymns of St. Ambrose. The Church recognized this, and culled them out for its use. Some are in the Roman breviary, and one is in the Mozarabic liturgy of Spain. Surely lines like the following could not lie buried in a Pindaric hymn when they might adorn the feast of the Holy Innocents:

Salvete, flores martyrum,
Quos lucis ipso in limine
Christi insecutor sustulit,
Ceum turbo nascentes rosas.

However, these centonic hymns of the breviary are only partially successful. The excerptor never knows when to stop; his excerpt ends in incompleteness or anticlimax. That is because Prudentius did not intend this use to be made of such passages; he meant them for contributing effects.

The reader of the *Apotheosis* and the *Hamartigeneia*, which, as we saw, are quite as Virgilian as Lucretian, may wonder why Prudentius did not take his place among those writers who, in a steady stream from the time of Juvenecus, had essayed to turn the Holy Scriptures into Virgilian epic. Gennadius, *Vir. Ill.* 13, makes a dubious reference to a work of Prudentius, perhaps entitled *Hexaemeron*, which would have included in verse the same material that St. Ambrose put into his prose work of the same name. It would be an account of the first week of creation, and an interesting precursor of Tasso and Du Bartas. But I am not going to accept its existence until I have to, for it is easier to believe that Prudentius did not care to enter the field of biblical epic. He is an original poet; he wanted to do something new. Instead of another metrified *Genesis*, he wrote the first allegorical epic in Christendom, the *Psychomachia*, an allegory of the battles of the virtues and the vices for the soul, and whatever its defects, a pattern of poetic allegory for many generations to come.

Epic of another sort, combined with other poetical forms, occurs in one of the latest of Prudentius' works and one of his best, the poem *contra Symmachum*. The controversy over the altar of Victory, which our President described to you in his scholarly paper last year, had been settled by St. Ambrose. Some twenty years later, when the greatness of this episode stood out in its true proportions, Prudentius saw its fitness for an epic theme. He made a kind of epic of it,⁷ brief in bulk but large in scope. It is in the reign of Honorius; the poet can look back from a tranquil place to the scene of the contest. And he looks back farther still. He begins with the

⁷ In the poem *contra Symmachum*.

lineage of the gods, and the part they played in Roman history. He lingers quite as affectionately on the primitive days of ancient Rome, when the gods had humble temples of thatch, as Virgil does in the eighth book of the *Aeneid*. The whole treatment is sympathetic and imaginative; Prudentius almost persuades me to become a pagan. He comes down to the cults of imperial Rome, not forgetting that of the Sun, till we reach the age of the triumph under Constantine. The mists of superstition now begin to disperse; the remnant of pagans is small and dwindling. But they turn for one more encounter before they leave the field. The protest of Symmachus is thus presented on a large background of history. It is an epoch in the story of the Eternal City, which is as dear to Prudentius as to Symmachus and to St. Augustine and to Dante. That history, however, is not one of decline, of the gradual betrayal of the gods that have watched over the city; it is the history of the true progress of Rome. Professor Bury, who has just published a book on the idea of progress, should have pondered this passage with more care, as well as one in the reply of St. Ambrose, and several more in other authors, before stating that the idea of human progress towards perfection was foreign to ancient and to Christian thought.⁸

The second book is devoted to the refutation of Symmachus. Like Ambrose, Prudentius quotes the several points made by Symmachus and disposes of them successively stroke for stroke. But his purpose is different. Ambrose is concerned with the practical question of preventing the restoration of the altar; he gains his object in the quickest time. Prudentius, writing at a safe distance, can view the matter in perspective and consider its larger bearings. It is a remarkable utterance. The work as a whole is a worthy memorial of the triumph of Christianity in the state and in society. Could Prudentius have translated it into sculpture he could have set his monument in the senate-house in place of the pagan altar, to im-

⁸ J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (1920), 14 f., 19, 20 f.

mortalize, as before, the ancient culture, but also its transmutation into the new and forward-looking ideals of the day. The attack on Symmachus is an obvious form of Christian apologetics, which here as in St. Augustine's *City of God* passes into a larger literary form. But all Prudentius' work, as I began by saying, is, in a way, apologetics; it is an apology not so much for Christian belief as for Christian culture. His plan, carried out with some defects, many successes, and occasional flashes of genius, was to confront pagan literary art with Christian forms that new in spirit were true to the ancient rules. He read the old authors with minute understanding and with deep delight; otherwise he could not have written as he did. Prudentius is not among the great writers; his very versatility interfered with the attainment of something really great. But among the lesser lights his eminence is incontestable; if Plautus, Propertius, and Juvenal deserve the title of classic, so does Prudentius. Historically, his works are of the utmost interest. They give the finest expression of Christian humanism that had appeared in poetry. Of his followers in the Middle Ages, few if any between his own times and those of Dante can contest this palm with him. And if we look merely at the many-sidedness of his achievements, he stands among them without a peer.

VII. — *Gemistus Pletho as a Moral Philosopher*

BY PROFESSOR JOHN WILSON TAYLOR

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

It is repeatedly said that Byzantine writers have given no evidence of originality in thought, and the verdict seems on the whole to be merited. If, however, we find one of them making a distinct claim to originality in any field, we ought to examine his claim with a readiness quickened by hope and an acumen sharpened by skepticism. Such a claim has been made by Gemistus Pletho in regard to his treatment of ethics. In a tract replying to an attack by Gennadius on an earlier philosophical treatise of his he wrote the following passage: "The facts regarding pleasure and the chief end of man have been much better systematized by us, with God's help, than by Aristotle, and we have given an adequate demonstration of them. In this we followed Plato in part but have elaborated them further than he did" (Migne, *Patr. Gr.* CLX, 999 D).

This has been spoken of as a claim to originality, but it would be more accurate to refer to it as an *admission* of originality. The charge of innovation, with Pletho as with Plato, his acknowledged master, was to be avoided; and his chief enemy, Gennadius, accused him of invoking the names of great men of the past in order to cloak heretical opinions of his own or those derived from Mohammedans or Neoplatonists (*ib.* 639). He had motives, therefore, for concealing his innovations, and it would not be surprising if it should be found that he did more than merely elaborate the principles expressed in Plato's works.

In his introduction to the *Laws* Pletho claims for his treatment of ethics the authority of Zoroaster, Plato, and the Stoics.¹ Schultze² noted this, and in partial reliance on it

¹ *Pléthon: Traité des lois*, par C. Alexandre (Paris, 1855), 2.

² *Die Philosophie der Renaissance* (Jena, 1874), 219.

but without any detailed examination characterized Pletho's ethics as of the Stoic school. Pletho's account of the highest good and of the criterion of the virtues has been discussed elsewhere³ by the writer; it is his purpose in this study to examine Pletho's account of the individual virtues to see how far they are derived from former philosophical systems and how far they represent a distinct departure from them. The examination will incidentally throw some light on the ideals and manner of working employed by this the last of the ancient and first of the modern Platonists.

Pletho's doctrine in regard to the virtues is to be found in a short tract, entitled *περὶ ἀρετῶν*, and first printed at Basel in 1552. It was reprinted by Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca*, CLX, 865 ff. Schultze in the book already cited reproduced the substance of the tract with a faithfulness which resulted virtually in a translation somewhat elaborated. The work is thrown into a schematic form which recalls the style of Aristotle.⁴ It begins by outlining a psychological basis for each of the cardinal virtues described in Plato's *Republic*. They are taken in the following order: temperance, courage, justice, wisdom. The order is not that of Plato, who was guided by the requirements of his argument, but is dictated by psychological considerations to be dealt with later. Each cardinal virtue is then divided into three species or parts,⁵

³ *Georgius Gemistus Pletho's Criticism of Plato and Aristotle* (University of Chicago doctoral dissertation, 1921), 76 ff.

⁴ This is surely the meaning of Alexandre's sentence (*op. cit.* vii and n. 1): "Ce traité est rédigé à la manière d'Aristote plutôt que de Platon." Schultze (p. 219) understood it as a general attribution of Aristotelian influence. He was quite right, of course, in insisting that Aristotle's view of virtues as means was consciously rejected, and that the only distinct trace of Aristotelian doctrine was in Pletho's definition of virtue as a *ἔξις* and in the statement that it requires for its development natural endowment, practice, and insight.

⁵ To speak of the *parts* of virtue was a Platonic habit which indicated a conviction of the essential unity of the virtues because of their common dependence on knowledge. Cf. *Prot.* 349 B, C. In a different sense, however, Plato divided a virtue into two parts in *Euthyph.* 12 E, according to the sphere of its exercise. It was this principle on which Pletho divided into 'parts' the cardinal virtues.

so that we obtain twelve virtues which represent the whole duty of man. This classification completed, the twelve virtues are again arranged, this time in the order of their development in the life of the individual. The result is an ascending series beginning with the most necessary and elementary virtue and leading to the rarest and highest.

In the arrangement of the virtues Pletho adopts not the Platonic but the Stoic psychology,⁶ according to which the soul is primarily divided into reason, which is rational, and the feelings, which are essentially irrational. The reason is the real self and it has relations with the irrational parts of the composite being, man, and with other individual men. The irrational parts of man are the desires, which are voluntary, and the fears, which are involuntary. The virtues are named according as they have reference to these different relationships. Man's virtue in relation to the voluntary, irrational part of himself, that is, to the desires, is *σωφροσύνη*; in relation to the involuntary feelings, *ἀνδρεία*; in relation to other men, *δικαιοσύνη*; and the virtue of the rational part of man is *φρόνησις* (Migne, *ib.* 865 ff.). The virtues of temperance and bravery, it will be seen, are defined here, as among the Stoics, in a more subjective manner than by Plato and Aristotle. Courage is not concerned with the objects of fear and confidence but with the feelings produced in the soul by these objects. The reason rules over the feelings as already existent instead of exercising a selective influence in their genesis.

Σωφροσύνη is not limited, as by Aristotle, to self-control regarding pleasures, nor is it broadened, as by Plato, to mean the harmony which keeps each part of the soul in its place. It is the virtue by which the desires are restricted to what is necessary and easy to obtain. This conception of the virtue plainly harks back to the Stoic ideal of independence and 'apathy' (Migne, *ib.* 872, A, B). The three traditional

⁶ That is, the element of the soul which Plato called *θυμός* was not retained in Pletho's theory.

kinds of desires — for pleasure, money, and honor⁷ — form the basis for the threefold division of self-control into *κοσμιότης*, *ἐλευθεριότης*, and *μετριότης*. *Κοσμιότης* is self-control in regard to the desire for pleasure; *ἐλευθεριότης* in respect to love of money; and *μετριότης* in ambition or love of fame.

The word *κοσμιότης* does not occur in Aristotle's scheme of virtues at all, but the quality so named by Pletho is variously referred to under the names of *σωφροσύνη* or *ἐγκράτεια*. Panaetius adopted the word but meant by it the mean between effeminacy and boorishness.⁸ Its usual significance among the Stoics, however, was a knowledge of seemly and unseemly movements.⁹ This appears to be merely a more specific definition of the meaning 'orderliness' which Plato usually attached to the word. But consistently with his tendency to generalize virtues and extend their application from the instinctive level to that of rationality Plato frequently employed the word to denote an orderly attitude of mind toward pleasure. Twice it is used as the opposite of *ἀκολασία* (*Phaedr.* 493 D and *Laws* 794 A); in the *Gorgias*, 508 A, *ἀκοσμία* and *ἀκολασία* are synonyms, and in the *Phaedrus*, 256 B, the adjective *κόσμιος* is used in the sense of *ἐγκρατὴς ἑαυτοῦ*. It is this force of the word in the writings of Plato which Pletho adopts. He is thus enabled to reserve the term *σωφροσύνη* for more important duty.

Κοσμιότης is placed lowest among the virtues by Pletho. There are two reasons for this: it is the most closely related to the animal instincts, and it is the most necessary virtue, since it contributes to the attainment of all the other virtues. By it man gains his independence of that preoccupation with animal desires which is a bar to further development (Migne, *ib.* 870 D, 872 A-C). The desires over which it rules are

⁷ Plato in *Rep.* viii distinguished the tyrannical and democratic man from the oligarchic and the timocratic man by the nature of their predominant motives, which were, respectively, the desire for pleasure, money, and fame.

⁸ Schmekel, *Philosophie der mittleren Stoa* (Berlin, 1892), 217.

⁹ Cf. Stob. II, 61, 9 Wachsmuth, and [Andronicus], *περὶ παθῶν*, 23, 7 Schuchhart.

divided, as by Plato (*Rep.* 558 D-559 B), into necessary and unnecessary. The former are to be indulged but the latter disregarded as far as possible because they are a hindrance to the soul's attainment of *φρόνησις* and *τὸ σωφρονεῖν*, according to Plato, or, according to Pletho,¹⁰ of *θεοσέβεια*, which in his account is the highest part of *φρόνησις*. Unnecessary desires which are base and unlawful are to be rooted out entirely.

Ἐλευθεριότης, as the second part of temperance, is self-control in the spending of money. As little as possible should be spent on necessities, but greater liberality should be shown in the procuring of beautiful objects (cf. Plato, *Rep.* 401 B ff.). Yet even in this care should be exercised lest the beauty of outward things come to seem more important than the beauty within the soul, its proper adornment, virtue (*Phaedo*, 114 E). Although this name was given to a virtue in the lists of Panaetius and other Stoics,¹¹ it was with them a division of justice rather than temperance and consisted in the conferring of benefits in accordance with the deserts of the beneficiary. Its content in Aristotle's account, where it is defined as the mean between prodigality and miserliness, is much nearer that given it by Pletho. The conception of it as a mean, however, was foreign to him. His description of the right attitude toward the use of money is based on Platonic points of view, as indicated by the *Republic*, 401 B ff. and *Phaedo*, 114 E. Nevertheless, Plato did not use the unqualified *ἐλευθεριότης* in this sense. When wishing to limit its application to the disposal of property, as in describing the character of Theaetetus (*Theaet.* 144 D), he was obliged to indicate his meaning by the phrase *ἡ τῶν χρημάτων ἐλευθεριότης*.

Μετριοτήτης is self-control in regard to the pursuit of fame. Such pursuit is good if the fame is for noble deeds, otherwise it is not worthy of any attention. The Stoic tone of this

¹⁰ Migne, *ib.* 872 B, C. Cf. Plato, *Rep.* 358 D, 359 B-C.

¹¹ Schmeckel, *op. cit.* 217, and [Andronicus], *op. cit.* 25, 9.

view is evident: a good name is plainly "indifferent" but "to be preferred" (cf. Cic. *Fin.* III, 57). The word *μετρίότης* as a designation of this virtue seems to be new in the literature of this type. Plato did not use it specifically in this sense and it is not to be found in Aristotle's list of virtues. Aristotle did describe the quality as the mean between that of the ambitious and the unambitious man, but he said it had no name of its own. It would seem that Pletho, although rejecting Aristotle's doctrine of the mean, had here made such a concession to it as to supply the technical term for which Aristotle pointed out the need, a term especially applicable to one who attains to the golden mean.

As a Stoic and Platonist it was logical for Pletho and as a man of energetic moral earnestness it was natural for him to magnify the virtue of courage. *ἀνδρεία* is not, as he maintained it was with Aristotle, the mere quantitative mean between rashness and cowardice (Migne, *ib.* 904 A-B). Modified as it was by the Stoic psychology (cf. p. 86 above), it nevertheless is not defined by Pletho, in the manner of Panaetius, as high-heartedness in every relation of life working for the realization of justice (Schmeckel, *op. cit.* 217), but rather, in the words of Plato (*Apol.* 29 A, *Crito*, 51 B), as the quality by which a man stands at his appointed post in life — taking his due part, Pletho adds, as parent, friend, neighbor, citizen, fellow-traveller, and member of the divinely ruled universe (Migne, *ib.* 720 D). Like temperance, it is concerned with holding the animal part of the composite being, man, in subjection to the divine element, since fears, like desires, are a part of man's irrational nature (Migne, *ib.* 869 D; CLXI, 720 D). It consists of three parts, according to the kind of objects of fear with which the individual has to deal. If they are "acts of God," occurrences beyond our power to influence, courage takes the form of *εὐψυχία*; if they are ills to be voluntarily borne to attain some end, it is *γενναϊότης*; if the objects of fear are due to the hostile acts of men, the virtue is called *πραότης*.

The published text of Pletho's work on the virtues gives ἀψυχία as the division of courage to be treated first. A summary of the virtues at the end of the tract, however, assigns to this division the name εὐψυχία, which Schultze adopted and which is unquestionably correct.¹² εὐψυχία was with Plato a glorious virtue. By it the Athenians of the Atlantis myth persevered, sometimes with allies and sometimes alone, until they overthrew the invading Atlantians (*Tim.* 25 B). It was the virtue which should be instilled into the infants in the ideal commonwealth to prevent them from yielding to terrors (*Laws*, 791 C). Nevertheless Pletho means something more definite by the term, though he gives it a description which is indebted for many hints to passages in Plato's writings. It is the virtue of the man, who, like Socrates,¹³ is confident that nothing can harm him except baseness entering his soul by way of false opinion. Such a man, when he meets with misfortunes, or rather, visitations of the providence of God, will not yield to grief but set about taking counsel as to the best course to pursue under the circumstances (*Rep.* 604 B-C). He will believe also that such blows of fortune have a purpose and are meant for his good (Migne, CLX, 873 C). They may be curative of some fault unknown to him, as medicine is to the sick; corrective, as punishment is to the child; or they may be strengthening only, as training is to the athlete. At any rate, armed with this virtue, he will, in confidence that God has called

¹² At the end of Pletho's tract he appended a schematic summary of the virtues. In it εὐψυχία appears as the first part of courage, whereas in the body of the tract it is given as the second part, being preceded by γενναίότης. The latter arrangement of the summary is consistent with the primacy given to δσιότης among the parts of justice and to θεοσεβεία among the parts of wisdom. In these cases the virtue having to do with one's relation to God is put first, and on this principle εὐψυχία should come first also. It may well be that the summary represents a change made by Pletho to secure consistency. ἀψυχος in Plato's works has no moral significance whatever. It means 'without life.' In classical Greek literature ἀψυχία is usually the vice of cowardice.

¹³ *Apol.* 41 C, D. For the effect of false opinion, or rather the expression of it, on the soul, cf. *Phaedo*, 115 E.

him, advance without a groan to meet earthquake, lightning, or death (Migne, *ib.* 997 C). The last part of this description has an unmistakable reference to Aristotle's opinion that a brave man was justified in showing fear at sea or in an earthquake, and that to do otherwise would be the part of a madman (*Eth. N.* 1115 b, 27). Aristotle, indeed, recognized this virtue neither in name nor reality. It is not a virtue of the common man. Chrysippus, the Stoic, catalogued it and defined it as the right tension of the soul for accomplishing its functions ([Andronicus], *op. cit.* 44). It is otherwise found defined by Stoics as that knowledge of the soul which makes it proof against defeat (Stob. II, 61, 17 W.; II, 147, 18). *Θάρσος* or *θαρραλεότης*, as described by this school, is closer to what Pletho meant by *εὐψυχία*. The scholiast on the *Iliad*, v, 2, says that *θάρσος*, according to the Stoic philosophers, consisted in persuading oneself that one could be overtaken by nothing terrible. Chrysippus is said to have so defined *θαρραλεότης* (*ib.* II, 61, 14). We may sum up, then, by saying that Pletho may have chosen the name *εὐψυχία* under the influence of the Stoics, but he defined it rather in the manner of the Stoic virtue *θάρσος*. His detailed description of it, however, is almost wholly Platonic, somewhat heightened in *τόνος* by an implicit criticism of Aristotle's unheroic attitude.¹⁴

¹⁴ Draeseke in his article "Georgios Gemistos Plethon" (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XIX, 279) compares Pletho's fearfulness in publishing his *Laws* with the fearlessness of Luther in publishing his 'theses,' much to the detriment of Pletho. To one accepting Draeseke's point of view Pletho's description of *εὐψυχία* would appear to be the words of a coward who idealized a courage he would like to possess. The comparison, however, is extremely unfair because of the radically different outlook of the two men. Luther's truth was God's truth which must prevail in any case. Luther's part was to preach it on pain of eternal death. Pletho, however, was not a Christian but a philosopher and, in particular, a Platonist. A better society might arise or it might not. If it did, it would be only because the right principles of organization were applied and the right doctrines accepted. Of these Pletho regarded himself as the expositor and the legislator who should make them effective in his native land. The open opposition of the church and state might very well destroy the last chance of their realization. His attitude in this was essentially that

Γενναιότης, the endurance of suffering necessary to the attainment of a desired end, is not found as a virtue, in name at least, in Aristotle's scheme nor in the ethics of the Stoa. The noun is not in Ast's *Lexicon Platonicum*, but the corresponding adjective means in Plato's writings 'well-born' or, in a wider sense, simply 'noble' or 'excellent,' and is often used in an ironical sense. Pletho seems, therefore, to have used the word with a meaning unsupported by earlier authority. Nevertheless, there are strong reasons for believing that he followed a Platonic lead. In the first place, Plato, in the *Republic*, 357 C, divides 'goods' into three kinds, one of which is a good which must be purchased at the expense of some undesirable experience. This is precisely the situation which the virtue of γενναιότης enables the good man to meet successfully. But the Plethonic virtue has a still closer connection with Plato's words. We have seen that εὐψυχία is the virtue of one who, like Socrates before his judges, holds that nothing can harm a good man. Plato described the attitude of Socrates, and Pletho supplied the term by which to designate it. The same thing happened in the case of γενναιότης, except that here Plato indirectly suggested the term which Pletho chose. In the *Phaedo*, where Plato describes the attitude of Socrates in the face of death, he uses no special word to designate that attitude but does make the jailer refer to Socrates as the γενναιότατος and πραότατος of men (116 C). The nouns derived from these two adjectives form the second two divisions of courage in Pletho's scheme. In a writer so studious of the thought and words of Plato as was Pletho it is scarcely open to doubt that this very passage was used in the choice of names for these divisions, and that, for the purpose of naming them, the first of these epithets was interpreted as referring to of Plato (cf. *Rep.* 496 B, 540 D and the author's *Pletho's Criticism of Plato and Aristotle*, 91). It will be seen, therefore, that as between Luther and Pletho the objects of fear and confidence were totally different. The comparison of their courage as made by Draeseke is therefore misleading and his conclusion

Socrates' willingness to endure death in order to secure a good end, namely, obedience to the laws (*Crilo*, 54 B), or, perhaps, a happier existence (*Phaedo*, 114 C-D). The second epithet would then be connected with the fact that the suffering was inflicted on Socrates by those who wished him no good (*Apol.* 41 D), such being the occasion for the exercise of the Plethonic virtue of *πραότης*.

Γενναιότης, like *κοσμιότης*, is a preparation for the higher virtues, and as such is placed second to the lowest in value and next to the most necessary for development. It brings its own reward, also, Pletho holds (Migne, *ib.* 872 D, 873 A), since by training ourselves to endure suffering we enhance our enjoyment of the pleasures which we do receive (*Phaedo*, 60 B, C), while those who yield to every pleasure soon find that their enjoyment palls with excess.¹⁵ Furthermore, we thereby strengthen our bodies and characters so as to be more insensible to sufferings which we cannot avoid.

The third division of courage is *πραότης*. This is substantially the same virtue as that which Aristotle, followed by Chrysippus (Stob. II, 115, 10), describes as the mean between *ὀργιλότης* and *ἀοργησία*. Pletho's description of it, however, shows how far he was removed, in part through the influence of Plato, from Aristotle's coldness of spirit, which, as Pletho says (Migne, *ib.* 993 B), made of his ethics a corpse. The content of the virtue is, as already shown, the forbearance of a great man in the face of malicious hostility. We are not charged, Pletho maintains (Migne, *ib.* 876 B), with the control of the minds of others. They must act according to what seems best to them. If we fail to persuade them that our opinions are no less advantageous for them than their own, we should blame ourselves for our failure and not be angry with them (cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 470 C; *Rep.* 337 D, etc.). This Utopian tolerance in Pletho's case was not due to the influence

¹⁵ To advocate self-control with a view to the enhancement of pleasure is not Platonic (cf. *Rep.* 573 E).

of Christianity; it was Socratic, being repeatedly advocated in Plato's works, since it followed logically upon the Socratic paradox that vice is involuntary. The word *πραότης* was not, of course, used technically by Plato in this exalted sense. It probably has this significance in *Phaedo*, 116 C, and it might conceivably bear the meaning in an idealizing passage of the *Critias*,¹⁶ where the dealings of the Atlantians with each other are described. In these cases it is the context which forces the meaning on the word. Pletho uses it technically with this significance, arbitrarily assigning to it a meaning drawn from Plato's general philosophy.

The two cardinal virtues so far dealt with have relation to the lower parts of man's own soul. By temperance the desires are kept in leash and by courage fears are controlled. The next cardinal virtue, *δικαιοσύνη*, is concerned with what is external to man. It is divided according as it has reference to God, to society, or to individual men. That justice should have reference to one's relation to God is an extension of its meaning not found in Aristotle, nor, apparently, in the writings of the Stoics. It is found, however, in a passage of Plato's *Euthyphro* (12 D-E). In it 'the just' applies to all dealings of man, and its first 'part,' applying to his dealings with the gods, is called *τὸ θεῖον*. Pletho uses the form *ὁσιότης* for the first part of justice. Justice in one's relations

¹⁶ 120 E. There would seem to be an inconsistency between the tolerance advocated by Pletho in his work on the virtues and the fact that he prescribes in his *Laws* the penalty of death by fire for indulgence in such sexual intercourse as was not to be permitted by the constitution of the ideal state and for innovations in doctrine on this score (Alexandre, *op. cit.* 124, 126). It may be noted that since Plato attributed to some fault in the union of the sexes the hypothetical decline from the best condition of the state (*Rep.* 546 B), Pletho may have decided that any offence against the prescribed, and presumably faultless, arrangement, as the *prima labes malorum*, called for the extreme penalty as a deterrent for others. In any case, the legislation is extraordinarily severe in view of the fact that Pletho protests against the infliction of cruel punishments (maiming) in the Greece of his day (Migne, CLX, 836 C). It represents a distinct divergence from the Platonic point of view in the direction of later Neoplatonic and Christian puritanism — not carried to the point of asceticism, however (cf. n. 15 above).

with society is called *πολιτεία*, and in one's dealings with individual men, *χρηστότης*. The Stoic Panaetius placed two subsidiary virtues under *δικαιοσύνη* (Schmeckel, *op. cit.* 217), but they did not correspond to Pletho's divisions. They were *δικαιοσύνη* proper and *ἐλευθεριότης*, which with Pletho is a part of self-control.

Ὁσιότης is one's right attitude and activity in relation to God. This is practically Plato's definition in the *Euthyphro*, and the Stoics likewise agreed on it.¹⁷ It avoided, according to Pletho, two equally fatal errors. One was the atheism that despised prayers, worship, hymns, first-fruits, and the like, and the second was the superstition which believed that God was really influenced by them (Migne, *ib.* 877 C-D). Both these doctrines were Platonic views, expressed in the *Laws*, 907 B, and the *Republic*, 381 B-C. What then was the value of prayer and other forms of worship? They were to deter the soul from evil and strengthen it in the practice of virtue. This explanation of the value of prayer is sufficiently like that of Proclus to warrant the juxtaposition of the two. Proclus, in a passage of his commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* (I, 208, 3 ff. Diehl), with which Pletho was demonstrably familiar,¹⁸ quotes Porphyry to the effect that those who do not believe in the existence or providence of the gods, or who hold that they are unchangeable, cannot logically attach any value to prayer, while those who hold none of those views can. Its value, Porphyry (as quoted by Proclus) then proceeds to say, is its efficacy (1) in correcting one's life, (2) enabling one to become like God, and (3) aiding him to obtain complete virtue. Pletho, although he holds that the gods are unchangeable, yet maintains that prayer has value and advocates in substance

¹⁷ The definition of Chrysippus is, "the knowledge which makes people faithful and observant of justice toward the divine" ([Andronicus] *op. cit.* 25, 18-20). A more common Stoic definition runs as follows: "the right knowledge concerning the honoring of God, the same being also called justice" (Stob. II, 68, 9-15; 147, 3-5; Diog. L. 119; Sext. Emp. IX, 24; Clem. Al. *Strom.* VII, 12 (IX, 317 Migne); Suidas, s.v. *καθολίωσις πρὸς θεόν*).

¹⁸ *Pletho's Criticism of Plato and Aristotle*, 33.

the first and third benefits which Porphyry assigned to it.¹⁹ The omission of the second is noteworthy because it is the only value assigned to *ὁσιότης* by Psellus, whom Pletho frequently followed in other departments of thought.²⁰ The explanation is probably to be found in the fact that likeness to God, in Pletho's opinion, was effected by intellectual activity only.

The second division of justice is called *πολιτεία*. This is a surprising word to find in the sense of good citizenship, instead of *πολιτική*, which was used by Chrysippus and appears as an adjective with or without *ἀρετή* in many passages of Plato and Aristotle. There is no previous authority for this form in the ethics of Aristotle or the Stoics, or, as far as I am able to discover, in any classical author. Nor did the word in later Greek acquire the meaning given it by Pletho. Apparently the name for this second division of justice, and for the first as well, was based on Plato's *Laws*, 697 B-C, a passage after which Pletho modelled one of the opening sentences of his own *Laws* (Alexandre, *op. cit.* 44). In this passage Plato states that the city which is to be safe and attain happiness must assign honors rightly. After explaining what is meant by such an assignment, Plato goes on impressively: "If any legislator or city departs from these principles, preferring honors or money or esteeming more highly what is really lower, he would be doing a thing neither *ὄσιον* nor *πολιτικόν*." *ὁσιότης* and *πολιτεία* are the first two parts of justice in Pletho's scheme. Why he does not use the form *πολιτική*, so similar to *φυσική*, which he does use (cf. p. 98 below), is not clear.

The content of *πολιτεία* is distinctly indebted to the Stoic conception of *δικαιοσύνη*. The political bond is found in reason and extended to all that has life. Plants,

¹⁹ To deter from evil is here taken to be the equivalent of correcting one's life, and strengthening in the practice of virtue the equivalent of the process of obtaining complete virtue.

²⁰ *Pletho's Criticism of Plato and Aristotle*, 34.

Pletho holds, have little to join them. Animals are bound together by their common possession of perception and feeling and by the world which is thereby made common to them. The gregarious animals approach the conscious sense of unity which joins men. Perhaps, he surmises, the beings higher than man, that is, the demons, live in a still closer interdependence. The good citizen, then, will aim at strengthening the political bond, knowing that when the common weal is assured he is safest, while, if it fails, his own private interests are ruined as well.²¹

The third part of justice is *χρηστότης*. This quality presents some similarity to *πραότης*, but seems to differ from it in that it is an active virtue, being shown in deeds, while *πραότης* refers to an attitude of mind. The one who is *χρηστός* will benefit others and suffer harm without retaliation. Being somewhat too heroic a virtue for the common man, it did not appear in form or substance in Aristotle's list, nor did it take quite so sublime a form even in the Stoic school.²² The word *χρηστός* in the fifth century B.C. usually meant simply 'good' as opposed to 'bad' or 'faulty' and was so employed by Plato, but later, perhaps by association with *θεοὶ*, as in Hdt. VIII, 111, or with *δεσπότης*, it came to mean 'merciful' or 'kind-hearted.' It frequently has this meaning in Menander (*Hero*, 48, *Samia*, 193 Koerte), the New Testament (e.g. Eph. 4, 32), and the writings of the physiognomists (*Scriptores Physiognomici*, I, 305, 18 Foerster; 338, 2, etc.). Stoic lists, as already noticed, contained the word used in a similar sense. It is just possible that Pletho read this meaning into the word as it occurred in a sentence

²¹ Migne, CLXI, 877 B-C. Pletho's statement that by this virtue man approaches the divine is merely another expression of the idea that the political bond is reason, which was, with him, the divine principle. Psellus likewise states that the political virtue brings about likeness to God (*de Omnisaria Doctrina*, 52, in Migne, CXXII, 688 A ff.). He finds difficulty in explaining how it does so, and takes refuge in saying that it produces the effect in an obscure and shadowy manner.

²² It is defined as *ἐπιστήμη εὐποιητική* in Stob. II, 62, 3 and 147, 5-7.

of Plato's *Gorgias* (521 D), in which Socrates was made to say that no one who was *χρηστός* would bring accusation against a man who had done no wrong. However this may be, the content which Pletho gave to the virtue was thoroughly Platonic. Socrates is represented by Plato as frequently affirming that it is better and more god-like to suffer evil than to do it (*Apol.* 30 C-D; *Gorg.* 508 B, 509 B-C). But Stoic influence is to be seen in Pletho's further statement that to do so is to put oneself into harmony with the universe instead of dragging against it (Migne, *ib.* 876 C-D).

The virtue of man as man is *φρόνησις*. That part of man by which he differs essentially from other animals is reason, and *φρόνησις* is his virtue in relation to reason. It is divided into three parts according as it amounts to knowledge of God, of nature, or of human affairs. The three parts are, respectively, *θεοσέβεια*, *φυσική*, and *εὐβουλία*.

Θεοσέβεια is substantially the *θεωρία* of Aristotle's account (*Eth. N.* 1177 b, 19 ff.), or the synoptic view of all things in Plato's *Republic* (511 A, 537 C). It is man's task to understand the causes and laws of natural phenomena and the reason why things are good or evil for men. When he has reached a final, unifying view by which the purpose, the *ἀγαθόν*, of all is plain, he has attained to a view of God, to *θεοσέβεια*, and to the height of human happiness (Migne, *ib.* 877 D, 880 A). The highly intellectual content of this virtue marks it as Platonic rather than Stoic.²³

With the pantheistic Stoics a knowledge of physics was one aspect of the virtue of wisdom, being equivalent to one's comprehension of God.²⁴ Pletho naturally did not follow them as far as this, though with him a knowledge of physics, which he called *φυσική*, contributed greatly to man's happi-

²³ It is true that the Stoics emphasized logic (cf. Arnold, *op. cit.* 306 and n. 36), but it was understood only as a method, an organon. *φρόνησις* was strictly practical (cf. Arnold, 306, n. 31). The nearest approach to an intellectual virtue among them was the so-called *φυσική* in the list of Chrysippus (cf. [Andronicus], *op. cit.* 20, 22).

²⁴ Arnold, *op. cit.* 306; Schmekel, *op. cit.* 216.

ness, since it demanded the activity of the highest part of himself²⁵ and because it emancipated him from trifles into a larger world, or rather, into the universe, in which his mind thenceforth had its dwelling place.²⁶

The form of the word *φυσική*, used independently as the name of a virtue, has a precedent in a Stoic list ascribed to Chrysippus, where it is found along with several other names of virtues with the same formation ([Andronicus], *op. cit.* 20, 22).

In reference to the virtue of *εὐβουλία* Pletho was able to find Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics all on common ground. The word itself occurs in the three sources, although Aristotle more often used the word *φρόνησις*. It differs, in Pletho's account, from the somewhat similar *πολιτεία*, being the intellectual qualification for the practical virtue which *πολιτεία* indicates.

From the foregoing examination of the Plethonic virtues a few general conclusions may be formulated. Pletho followed Plato, as he himself said, and, apart from the adoption of the cardinal virtues, he followed him in two ways. In the first place, he included in his scheme many virtues mentioned by Plato incidentally in the course of his writings. Such are *κοσμιότης*, *εὐβουλία*, *εὐψυχία*, *γενναιότης*, *πραότης*, *ᾠσιότης*, *εὐσέβεια*. But in his manner of using them he may be said to have gone beyond Plato, for he used most of them in senses not found attached to them in Plato's works. In determining the new senses, however, he followed Plato in a second way, that is, by giving to the words meanings developed from Platonic doctrines and opinions. This applies to all in the above list except *εὐβουλία*, which remained substantially as used by his master and his other ancient models. *γενναιότης*, *πραότης*, and *χρηστότης* seem to be definitely the virtues of the Platonic Socrates. *ἐλευθεριότης* and *φυσική* in name and content, and *μετρίότης* and *πολιτεία* in content,

²⁵ 'Physics' is used to mean the science of the whole material universe.

²⁶ Cf. *Theaet.* 173 E and *Rep.* 518 A, 537 C; also *Cic. Fin.* III, 37.

appear to follow the Peripatetic and Stoic tradition. The influence of Stoicism is seen not only in the Stoic psychology upon which the virtues were based, but also in some elements in the description of virtues that in the main followed Plato's or Aristotle's account. Such virtues are *μετρίότης*, *εὐψυχία*, *πραότης*, *πολιτεία*, *φυσική*. Pletho seems to have been alone in using *πολιτεία* and *μετρίότης* as the virtues, respectively, of good citizenship and moderate ambition for accomplishing good deeds.

It is now possible to estimate in what Pletho's alleged originality consisted. He did not develop a new point of view nor did he profess to do so. What he did was to study carefully Plato's moral philosophy and draw up a scheme of virtues which would in the main express the Platonic ideals of self-control, courage, justice, and wisdom. He departed from these ideals in two notable points. He adopted the Stoic dogma of the brotherhood of man, and his attitude toward certain kinds of sexual irregularity had a severity, one might almost say ferocity, which was foreign to classical Greek thought but which is understandable in one who was heir to the Neoplatonic tradition, especially since historical Platonism and the all-pervasive influence of Christianity were in this respect at one. There remains to be noted the closeness of the study which Pletho devoted to the writings of Plato, as shown by this investigation. If this is compared with the relative ignorance of them shown by the former Byzantine Platonist, Michael Psellus, it indicates clearly that the Renaissance was at hand, and helps to explain the ability of Pletho to reawaken in Italy an interest in Platonism.

VIII. — *Spontaneous Generation and Kindred Notions in Antiquity*¹

BY DR. EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE doctrine of spontaneous generation, or, as it was named by Huxley, abiogenesis, originated in remote antiquity, flourished throughout ancient times and the Middle Ages, and lasted until modern times. As late as 1870 it still possessed sufficient vitality to interest the British Association for the Advancement of Science. In that year in his presidential address Huxley gave a summary of the investigations by which it was refuted.² In view of the millennia during which the belief in abiogenesis persisted, its historical importance in connection with biology, and the association with it of names like Aristotle, Pasteur, and Huxley, it seems worth while to write in some detail the initial chapter in its history.

In historic Greek antiquity³ the existence of every species of animal the sex history of which was not known, was accounted for by spontaneous generation or some kindred notion. This theory was necessarily resorted to in the case of those insects and animals of which the female⁴ was supposed to be lacking, or the male,⁵ or both male and female,⁶ or which for

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this article for works frequently referred to: *H.A.*, Aristotle, *Historia Animalium*; *G.A.*, Aristotle, *de Generatione Animalium*; *Ael.*, Aelian, *de Natura Animalium*; *Pl.*, Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*; *Isid.*, Isidorus, *Origines*. I have used Thompson's translation of the *H.A.* and Platt's rendering of the *G.A.*

² See the *Scientific Memoirs of Thomas Henry Huxley*, III, 572-594.

³ There are two Mycenaean vases which it is not unreasonable for us to look upon as our earliest evidence of the existence of the doctrine of spontaneous generation. On them we see various animals springing into existence. For illustrations and description of the vases, see Perrot-Chipiez, *Art in Primitive Greece*, II, 390-399.

⁴ *E.g.*, the scarab, *Ael.* x, 15; the tiger, *Tzetz. Chil.* XII, 731.

⁵ *E.g.*, the vulture, *Ael.* II, 46; some species of fish, *H.A.* 539 a 29, *Pl.* IX, 56. As a result of the belief that there were no males among vultures, the Egyptians made that bird an emblem of nature (*Amm.* XVII, 4, 11).

⁶ *E.g.*, bees, *Aug. Civ. Dei*, xv, 27; salamanders, eels, shellfish, *Pl.* x, 189;

other reasons did not have the power of reproduction.⁷ Parthenogenesis⁸ and hermaphroditism⁹ were called upon to explain the existence of more creatures than the facts warrant.

With increasing knowledge one animal after another was probably removed from the list of animals whose origin was explained by the notions under consideration; but even philosophers assigned to abiogenesis the original creation of animals, and so apparently differed from their illiterate countrymen only in restricting its scope in their own day. Whenever Aristotle and the scientific men of his time were unable to find out the facts, or to formulate a plausible theory, they simply accepted the traditional popular opinion. For example, though the advanced thinkers of his day proposed the theory that bees originate from the union of the sexes, the great scientist makes merely cursory mention of their views, and then goes on to record what must have been prevailing popular notions (*G.A.* 759 a-b).

It is quite possible that ideas kindred to the notion of spontaneous generation may have been used by the remote ancestors of the Greeks to account for the perpetuation of the human species. Frazer, *Attis, Adonis, and Osiris*, 80 and 220, notes that the lowest existing tribes of Central Australia are not aware that offspring are the result of the union of the sexes, and expresses the belief that such ignorance may once have been universal among mankind. There were among the Greeks some time-honored ceremonies which seem to point to a past when the true nature of parentage was un-

certain insects and fish, *H.A.* 538 a 1-3 (cf. also *H.A.* 539 a 29), *G.A.* 741 b 1; *Testacea*, *G.A.* 715 b 18; a kind of mullet, *G.A.* 741 b 1.

⁷ E.g., mules, *Aug. Civ. Dei*, xv, 27; small fish, *H.A.* 569 a 30.

⁸ *Chane*, a species of sea fish, *Ov. Hal.* 108. See Aubert und Wimmer, "Die Parthenogenesis bei Aristoteles," *Zeit. f. wiss. Zool.* ix (1858), 509-521; Georgievitch, "Parthenogenesis in Serbian Popular Tradition," *Folk-Lore*, 1918, 58-65.

⁹ E.g., *τροχός*, an unidentified animal, *G.A.* 757 a 5, Pl. ix, 166 (but compare ix, 56). For what seem to be hermaphroditic fish, see *H.A.* 538 a 18-22. Hares are said to possess the characteristics of both sexes and to be able to become pregnant without the aid of the male (*Archelaus*, ap. Pl. viii, 218).

known.¹⁰ At such a period may have originated the story that the mother of Attis was impregnated by an almond (Paus. VII, 17, 11), or, according to Arnobius (*adv. Nat.* v, 6), by a pomegranate. We find in Greek literature traditions hoary with age telling how man sprang from the oak tree, the ash tree, a stone, etc.,¹¹ notions which are after all only specific forms of the very general belief in autochthonous origin.

Aristotle says that if men and quadrupeds are really 'earth-born,' they came into existence either through the formation of a scolex, 'larva,' or else from eggs (*G.A.* 762 b 28). He eliminates the second alternative because he saw no animals being generated spontaneously from eggs, but did see (as he thought) insects and *Testacea* arising from the scolex (*G.A.* 763 a 4).¹²

Aristotle takes pains to express his own views about the process of spontaneous generation (*G.A.* 762 a 10). He maintains that animals do not originate from putrefied matter, but rather from an admixture of rain water with matter undergoing putrefaction. The sweet elements in this combination produce the animals, while the putrefied matter is the residue of the process. This view seems to be unique.¹³

Since insects are so small, it is not surprising that the sex history of some of them totally eluded the observation of the ancients. After naming a few whose manner of reproduction was known to him, Aristotle continues: "Other insects¹⁴ are

¹⁰ See Jane Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* 2, 122-124, and *Themis*, 266. For a comparative study of such physiological ignorance, see E. S. Hartland, *Primitive Paternity*, II, 249-286.

¹¹ See Preller, *Gr. Mythologie* 4, I, 78-87, and Sikes, *Anthropology of the Greeks*, 25 f.

¹² In order to keep this paper within reasonable limits, but scant attention is given to general theories and speculations about the original creation of animals by spontaneous generation. This material can be found in general works on Greek philosophy, and in the annotations on Lucretius, v, 771-924, where the poet formally sets forth his view of the origin of life.

¹³ Compare *Lucr.* II, 1156, Paus. VIII, 29, 4.

¹⁴ From the last few words of the quotation it will be seen that Aristotle's *ἐντομα ζῷα* is broader than the word 'insects' in English, including apparently all segmented creatures. In some of my notes to the quotation I have included

not derived from living parentage, but are generated spontaneously: some out of dew falling on leaves,¹⁵ ordinarily in springtime, but not seldom in winter when there has been a stretch of fair weather and southerly winds; others grow in decaying mud¹⁶ or dung,¹⁷ others in timber,¹⁸ green and dry; some in the hair of animals;¹⁹ some in the flesh of animals;²⁰ and some in excrement, not only after it has been voided,²¹ but while it is yet within the living animal, like the helminthes or intestinal worms''²² (*H.A.* 551 a 1).

Still other insects originate from vegetation,²³ from worms, since the ancient words for worms, as well as the word 'worms' in popular meaning today, include the larvae of insects.

¹⁵ *E.g.*, caterpillars and many others, *Pl.* XI, 112. Dew was one means by which the sky-father impregnated the earth-mother: see Cook, *Zeus*, I, 733. The inhabitants of Imbros still pray for dew to fertilize man, plants, and animals (*Harrison, Themis*, 174).

¹⁶ *E.g.*, worms, *Sext. Emp. Hyp.* I, 41; lice, *H.A.* 557 a 22.

¹⁷ *E.g.*, grubs, *H.A.* 552 a 16 and 21; scarab, *Suid. s.v. κάλθαρος*; caterpillars, *Isid.* XX, 8, 8 (cf. *Pall.* IV, 15, 4).

¹⁸ *E.g.*, myops or horsefly, *H.A.* 552 a 29; worms, *Ael.* V, 3; *πιθήκη*, *ib.* VI, 26; wood fretter, *Pl.* XI, 66; a kind of tree larva and the gadfly or breeze fly, *ib.* XI, 113; a kind of gnat, *ib.* XV, 80. Worms are produced from putrefying sap, *ib.* XVI, 220.

¹⁹ *E.g.*, animalcules, such as the clothes moth, from wool, *H.A.* 557 b 1 (cf. *Pl.* XI, 115 and 117); *Taeniae*, from the hair of men, *Pl.* XI, 114.

²⁰ *E.g.*, lice, *H.A.* 556 b 29; gadfly from an animalcule, *ib.* 551 b 21; glow worm from caterpillar, *ib.* 551 b 23; gnats from ascarids, *ib.* 551 b 27; cockchafer from grub, *ib.* 552 a 15; a kind of beetle from grubs, *ib.* 552 a 19; flies from grubs, *ib.* 552 a 21; gnats from grubs, *ib.* 552 b 5; butterflies from caterpillars, *ib.* 551 a 13; 'stag beetles' from grubs, *ib.* 551 b 18; certain winged insects from grubs, *ib.* 552 a 18; tapeworms, *Pl.* XI, 113; ticks, *ib.* 116; a kind of beetle from caterpillars, *ib.* 118, *Ael.* IX, 39. Cf. *Sen. N.Q.* II, 31: *Fulmine icta (corpora) inter paucos dies verminant.*

²¹ *E.g.*, grub, *H.A.* 552 a 16; flea, *ib.* 556 b 25-27; wood fretter, *Pl.* XI, 65; worms, *Lucr.* II, 871-873.

²² *E.g.*, flatworm, round worm, ascarid, *H.A.* 551 a 9; tapeworms, *Pl.* XI, 114.

²³ *E.g.*, caterpillars from cabbage, *H.A.* 551 a 14; *όρσοδάκναι*, plant-eating insects, from cabbage stalks, *ib.* 552 a 30; cabbage worm from cabbage, *ib.* 551 b 19; leekbane from the leek, *ib.* 551 b 20 (cf. *Ael.* IX, 39), *Antoninus Liberalis*, 22; ticks from couch grass, *H.A.* 552 a 15; grubs from pulse, *ib.* 552 a 19; *Cantharides* from grain, *Ael.* IX, 39, *Pl.* XVIII, 152; *Cantharides* from flowers, *Pl.* XI, 118; gnats from leaves, *ib.* XVI, 29; worms from roots, *ib.* XVIII, 151; a kind of gnat from fig trees, *ib.* XI, 118; caterpillars from vegetation,

snow,²⁴ rain or a damp languid heat,²⁵ from used wash water,²⁶ foul water,²⁷ slime of wells,²⁸ slime of vinegar,²⁹ wine,³⁰ old wax,³¹ dried sweat,³² little sack-like objects on the river Hypanis,³³ from fire,³⁴ paper,³⁵ damp dust,³⁶ and books.³⁷ A most peculiar notion is the one which attributes the origin of the cicada to the spittle of cuckoos.³⁸ Another view for the origin of the cicada is the readily explainable one that it was born from the earth. In the days when the Greeks wore long hair, they clasped it with a golden cicada to indicate that they too were autochthonous.³⁹

The origin of a number of insects is ascribed to the carcasses of the larger animals. It was supposed that the hornet was generated in horses⁴⁰ or in mules;⁴¹ the wasp in asses⁴² or in horses;⁴³ drones in mules⁴⁴ or in horses;⁴⁵ scarabs in Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41; gall insects from wild figs, *ib.* See also Theophr. *H.P.* II, 8, 2-3; III, 12, 6; IV, 14, 2; IV, 14, 5; IV, 14, 10; V, 4, 5; VII, 5, 4; VII, 5, 6; VIII, 10, 1; VIII, 10, 4-5; VIII, 11, 2; IX, 5, 3.

²⁴ Worms, *i.e.*, the well-known snow fleas, snow worms, or glacier fleas (*Poduridae*), *H.A.* 552 b 8 (cf. Pl. XI, 118); Antig. 90.

²⁵ Caterpillars, Theophr. *H.P.* IV, 16; Pl. XVII, 229 (cf. *ib.* XI, 115).

²⁶ Pl. XI, 115.

²⁷ *Conopes*, Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41.

²⁸ Ascarids, *H.A.* 551 b 27; 552 a 12-14.

²⁹ The vinegar fly (*Oinopota cellaris*), *H.A.* 552 b 5 (cf. *G.A.* 721 a 10; *Geopon.* VI, 14, 4; Pl. IX, 160).

³⁰ *Ephemera*, Ael. II, 4; *Bibiones*, Isid. XII, 8, 16; a species of flea, Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41.

³¹ *Acari*, 'mites,' *H.A.* 557 b 7.

³² Bugs, *ib.* 556 b 27.

³³ *Ephemera*, *H.A.* 552 b 17, Pl. XI, 120. Cf. Ael. V, 43, Cic. *Tusc.* I, 39, 94.

³⁴ A winged insect, *H.A.* 552 b 10, *G.A.* 737 a 1, Pl. XI, 119, Ael. II, 2, Ov. *Fast.* VI, 292, Antig. 90, Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41.

³⁵ Pl. XI, 117.

³⁶ Pl. XI, 115; cf. XI, 117.

³⁷ *H.A.* 557 b 8.

³⁸ Isid. XII, 8, 10, cf. Pl. XI, 95.

³⁹ Schol. on Ar. *Nub.* 984; cf. Eustathius Africanus, *Bas. Hex.* IX, 2 (XXX, 959 C Migne).

⁴⁰ Ov. *Met.* XV, 368; Pl. XI, 70; Pl. ap. Serv. *ad Geor.* IV, 286; Isid. XII, 8, 2 and 4.

⁴¹ Serv. *ad Aen.* I, 435.

⁴² Pl. ap. Serv. *ad Geor.* IV, 286; Serv. *ad Aen.* I, 435; Isid. XII, 8, 2.

⁴³ Ael. I, 28; Plut. *Cleom.* 39; Nic. *Ther.* 741; Orig. *contra Cels.* IV, 57; Antig. 23; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41; Suid. *s.v.* ἵππος; Varro, *R.R.* III, 16, 4; Pl. XI, 70; Serv. *ad Aen.* I, 435.

⁴⁴ Pl. ap. Serv. *ad Geor.* IV, 286; Isid. XII, 8, 2.

⁴⁵ Serv. *ad Aen.* I, 435.

asses⁴⁶ or in horses;⁴⁷ scorpions in crocodiles⁴⁸ or crabs;⁴⁹ and locusts in mules.⁵⁰

In spite of the intimate acquaintance of the ancients with the bee, there was no creature whose sex history was more shrouded in mystery or gave rise to a more interesting series of speculations. They had no inkling of the nuptial flight of the queen.⁵¹ Although, as stated before (p. 102), Aristotle does notice the theory of some men that this insect originated in the natural way, he does not take it seriously. It is recorded time and again in the classical languages that bees are generated in the bodies of putrefying oxen.⁵² It is stated, in fact, that oxen were deliberately killed to provide a breeding place.⁵³ If we may believe Antigonus (23), in certain places in Egypt bulls were buried with only the horns protruding, and when the carcasses had putrefied, the horns were sawed off and bees issued from the bodies. At times we find bees represented as springing from the blood of the slain animal (Verg. *Geor.* iv, 284), or even from worms that breed in the blood (Isid. xii, 8, 2).

An elaborate, almost ritual-like method of generating bees is described in the *Geoponica* (xv, 2, 22-29). Explicit directions are given for the construction of a house to confine the bull, for the method of selecting and killing the victim, and for the treatment of the carcass. If all the requirements are complied with, the house will finally be found "full of bees,

⁴⁶ Plut. *Cleom.* 39; Pl. xi, 70; Orig. *contra Cels.* iv, 57; Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* i, 41.

⁴⁷ Isid. xii, 4, 3. ⁴⁸ Antig. 23. ⁴⁹ Isid. xii, 4, 3. ⁵⁰ *Ib.* xii, 4, 3-4.

⁵¹ See *G.A.* 759 b 23, and Pl. xi, 46; also Royds, *Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*, 82.

⁵² It seems superfluous to give references. Many citations can be found in Pauly-Wissowa, *s.v.* *Biene*, and in *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, *s.v.* *apis*. For a fuller list of references see W. Robert-Tornow, *De apium mellisque apud veteres significatione et symbolica et mythologica* (Berlin, 1893), 19-29. See also A. E. Shipley, "The 'Bugonia' Myth," *Journ. of Phil.* xxxiv, 97-105, and A. B. Cook, "The Bee in Greek Mythology," *J.H.S.* xv, 1-24.

⁵³ Verg. *Geor.* iv, 531-558. Cf. Ov. *Fast.* i, 376-380, Pl. xi, 70, Liban. *Bov. Laud.* viii, 273 Foerster.

hanging together in clusters, and nothing left of the ox but horns, bones, and hair." Herodotus, v, 114, tells of the hiving of bees in the head of a decapitated man, and Servius, on Verg. *Aen.* I, 430, notes that Ceres caused bees to spring from the body of an old dame named Melissa.

The origin of the notion of carcass-born bees has been satisfactorily explained as due to the confusion of the bee with a fly of bee-like aspect, the *Eristalis tenax*. This 'double' of the bee resembles it so closely in structure and habits that the similarity has confused scientists as well as the unobservant. To its habit of ovipositing and breeding in carcasses has been attributed the rise of the belief under discussion.⁵⁴ The bee is cleanly. As regards the riddle of Samson (Judg. 14, 8), "the seeing of a swarm of bee-like flies was a fact; the finding and eating the honey was the myth grown out of the misconceived fact."⁵⁵

Another common notion as to the origin of bees was that young ones were gathered from flowers,⁵⁶ a belief that was found as late as the seventeenth century.⁵⁷

In the water, too, spontaneous generation was supposed to take place. Aristotle, *H.A.* 569 a 10-27, proves to his own satisfaction that certain fish spring either from mud and sand, or from the foul matter that rises as a scum. The first class is illustrated by a species of mullet⁵⁸ (*ib.* 569 a 24) and the second by little fish called 'froth' or 'foam'⁵⁹ (*ib.* 569 a 29). These fish, called also ἀφύαι, 'not born,'⁶⁰ may originate likewise from the foam thrown up by falling rain (*ib.* 569 b 15; Pl. IX, 160), from the rain itself (Pl. XXXI, 95), or from

⁵⁴ C. R. Osten Sacken, "The so-called Bugonia of the Ancients," *Smithsonian Report*, 1893, 487-500.

⁵⁵ *Ib.* 495.

⁵⁶ *H.A.* 553 a 17-24 (cf. Verg. *Geor.* IV, 200-201); Pl. XI, 46; Col. *R.R.* IX, 2, 4; Salv. *Gub. Dei*, IV, 43.

⁵⁷ Royds, *op. cit.* 85.

⁵⁸ Cf. 'sea hare,' Ael. II, 45.

⁵⁹ Compare the tradition that Aphrodite was 'foam-born.'

⁶⁰ Platt, commenting on *H.A.* 569 a 29, notes that young fry, especially those of the atherine or sand smelt, are called *nonnati* in the Adriatic, *nonnats* at Marseilles.

mud (Ael. II, 22). The so-called 'sea lungs' (πλεύμονες)⁶¹ are likewise spontaneously produced (H.A. 548 a 11).

The sex history of the eel caused the ancients as much perplexity as did that of the bee. Since eels spawn only in the depths of the sea, a fact that has not long been known, the ancients may be forgiven for not succeeding in solving the problem. Aristotle tells us that "the eel is neither male nor female and can engender nothing" (H.A. 538 a 2), "nor was an eel ever found supplied with either milt or spawn, nor are they when cut open found to have within them passages for spawn or for eggs" (ib. 570 a 16). Aristotle does not, however, content himself with negations, for he goes on to say that eels "grow spontaneously in mud and in humid ground; in fact, eels have at times been seen to emerge out of earthworms, and on other occasions have been rendered visible when the earthworms were laid open by either scraping or cutting. Such earthworms are found both in the sea and in rivers, especially where there is decayed matter; in the sea in places where seaweed abounds, and in rivers and marshes near to the edge; for it is near to the water's edge that sun-heat has its chief power and produces putrefaction"⁶² (H.A. 570 a 16-23).

In Athenaeus, VII, 298 c, we are told that eels entwine themselves and discharge a sort of viscous fluid from their bodies. This, it is said, lies in the mud and generates living creatures.⁶³ Pliny, IX, 160, explains that eels scrape themselves against rocks and the particles scraped off come to life.

The puzzle about the eel interested Izaak Walton. He does mention in a casual fashion the fact that some people believed in the generation of eels by sexual union, but he quotes with more confidence the views of those who hold "that they breed (as some worms do) out of the putrefaction

⁶¹ Theophrastus, *de Sign.* 40, speaks of them as οἱ πνεύμονες οἱ θαλάττιοι; Pliny, XVII, 359, calls them *pulmones marini*. On lungfish, see Schmucker, *Meaning of Evolution*, 176-177.

⁶² Thompson's translation.

⁶³ Cf. Opp. *Hal.* I, 516.

of the earth, and divers other waies." Still others, he informs us, say " that Eeles are bred of a particular dew falling in the Months of May and June on the banks of some particular Ponds or Rivers (apted by Nature for that end) which in a few dayes is by the Suns heat turned into Eeles " (*The Complete Angler*, chap. 10).

It was supposed that shellfish in general grew spontaneously in mud, slime, sandy bottoms, and in matter that collected on piles, logs of wood, and the bottoms of ships. Among them are oysters,⁶⁴ cockles, barnacles, limpets, nerites (*H.A.* 547 b 17-23), hermit crabs (*ib.* 548 a 15), mussels, scallops, and the murex (*Pl.* IX, 160).

Leeches and snails originate either on land or in the water (*Pl.* IX, 162).

It is, perhaps, not strange that the theory of spontaneous generation was employed to explain the existence of the smaller creatures of the land, such as insects, and of some of the smaller inhabitants of the deep whose sex history and anatomy were unknown, but the extension of the doctrine to a number of the larger and more familiar animals does small credit to ancient powers of observation. It was believed, for instance, that a female mouse could become pregnant simply by licking salt (*H.A.* 580 b 32: cf. *Ael.* IX, 3). Pliny, x, 185, records not only this view, but also a far more general one: *Generatio eorum lambendo constare, non coitu, dicitur*. Egyptian mice have a different story, for it is said that they were created from the generative powers of the water and the earth after the waters had subsided, and that the stages of their creation might be observed (*Pl.* IX, 179). Isidore, *Orig.* XII, 3, 1, records a view that they were born from the moisture of the earth.

There was a well-established notion in antiquity that frogs were generated from mud,⁶⁵ an idea that persisted beyond the Middle Ages. We find Sir Thomas Browne writing of frogs

⁶⁴ Aristotle gives his proof for this in *G.A.* 763 a 26-34.

⁶⁵ *Ov. Met.* xv, 375; *Sext. Emp. Hyp.* I, 41. See also *Pl.* IX, 72.

that arise from putrefaction and are called *temporariae* because they soon die.⁶⁶

There was a very common popular belief that snakes came from the marrow of the human spine,⁶⁷ being formed by the melting and gathering together of its juices (Plut. *Cleom.* 39). We may imagine that it was a pious mortal who started the story that this treacherous animal originated from the spines of wicked men (Ael. I, 51). At Tiryns certain small serpents were born from the ground (Pl. VIII, 229). Serpents in Africa grew from the blood that dropped from Medusa's head as Perseus carried it over that land (Ov. *Met.* IV, 616-620).

The wind, too, plays a prominent part in popular beliefs. Pliny, XVI, 93, tells us that animals mate and begin to conceive when Favonius starts to blow. This wind he calls *genitalis spiritus mundi*, 'the fecundating spirit of the world.' In view of such a statement, we are not greatly surprised to find the notion that mares conceived merely by allowing the wind to blow upon them.⁶⁸ This belief was given a rationalistic interpretation by Justin, 44, 3, to explain the extraordinary swiftness of the horses of Lusitania. The wind might also impregnate sheep,⁶⁹ tigers,⁷⁰ vultures,⁷¹ and partridges. Partridges had as a rule to be on the leeward side of the male.⁷² At times it was sufficient merely for the hen to smell the male or to hear his voice.⁷³

⁶⁶ Sir Thomas Browne's Works, I, 289 Bohn.

⁶⁷ Ov. *Met.* XV, 375 (cf. Pl. IX, 159); Sext. Emp. *Hyp.* I, 41.

⁶⁸ Varro, *R.R.* II, I, 19; Verg. *Geor.* III, 273-275; Sil. III, 379-383; Pl. VIII, 166; VIII, 189; XVI, 93; Col. *R.R.* VI, 27, 4; Aug. *Civ. Dei*, XXI, 5. This fiction may go as far back as the mares of Erichthonius (*Il.* XX, 223), but see Leaf's note *ad loc.* Cf. also *Il.* XVI, 150.

⁶⁹ Ael. VII, 27. If copulation takes place when the north wind is blowing, males are apt to be produced; if the south wind is blowing, females (*G.A.* 766 b 34).

⁷⁰ See allusion in Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* III, 265-266; Opp. *Cyneg.* III, 353.

⁷¹ Ael. II, 46; Plut. *Mor.* 286 A-B; Arist. *de Mir. Ausc.* 835 a 1; Horapollo, *Hieroglyphica*, I, 11; Dionysius, *'Opvθiakά*, I, 5; Phile, *de Animalium Proprietate*, 3; Amm. XVII, 4, 4; Tzetz. *Chil.* XII, 732-734; Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* III, 12; Isid. XII, 7, 12.

⁷² *H.A.* 541 a 27; 560 b 13; Ael. XVII, 15; Antig. 87; Pl. X, 102.

⁷³ *H.A.* 541 a 27; *G.A.* 751 a 13; Varro, *R.R.* III, 11, 4; Pl. X, 102; Ath. 389 e.

The belief in the generative powers of wind had its effect even on house-planning. One of the reasons why Vitruvius, VI, 7, 1, advises not to let the library face the south or west is because the winds from these directions give birth to book-worms (*Tineae*) and nourish them. It was said that a heavy atmosphere begot τετράγναθα (Ael. XVII, 40).

Wind eggs (*hyphenemia* or *zephyria*) are formed spontaneously in birds and fowls, such as doves, hens, partridges, peacocks, geese, and χηναλώπηκες.⁷⁴ Pliny (X, 166; cf. 160) attributes such eggs to the lustful thoughts of the females or to dust.

The generative power of water, especially in the form of rain, is insisted upon time after time by the ancient writers,⁷⁵ among them Lucretius, II, 871-873:

Quippe videre licet vivos existere vermes
Stercore de taetro, putorem cum sibi nacta est
Intempestivis ex imbribus umida tellus.

It is said that the salamander never appears except after rains (Pl. X, 188). Pliny, IX, 2, explains why many animals that live in water are larger than land animals: causa evidens umoris luxuria. Heat assists generation (*H.A.* 552 a 9). A combination of heat and moisture is most favorable as we see from Lucretius, VI, 797 f.:

Multaque nunc etiam existunt animalia terris
Imbribus et calido solis concreta vapore.⁷⁶

A very curious by-product of the theory of spontaneous generation is the belief that the intercourse of animals so created produces a different species.⁷⁷ Aristotle states and illustrates this belief in *H.A.* 539 b 8-12: "But whatever

⁷⁴ *H.A.* 539 a 31; *G.A.* 730 a 4; 741 a 18; 749 a 36; 750 b 3; 751 a 10, *et passim*; Soph. frag. 477 Jebb; Ath. I, 57 c; Col. *R.R.* VI, 27, 4; Isid. XII, 7, 81; Varro, *R.R.* II, 1, 19. See also Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.* I, 435, frag. 185-186; I, 605, frag. 19; II, 216, frag. 6; III, 31, frag. 104.

⁷⁵ E.g., in the case of the ἀφύη, Pl. XXXI, 95; a tiny fish, *H.A.* 569 a 13-18; eels, *ib.* 570 a 10; cicadas, Eustathius Africanus, *Bas. Hex.* IX, 2 (XXX, 595 C Migne).

⁷⁶ See also Ov. *Met.* I, 430 f., Pl. XVIII, 151.

⁷⁷ Cf. *G.A.* 715 b 2-15.

creatures are spontaneously generated, either in other animals, in the soil, or on plants, or in the parts of these, and when such are generated male and female, then from the copulation of such spontaneously generated males and females there is generated a something — a something never identical in shape with the parents,⁷⁸ but a something imperfect. For instance, the issue of copulation in lice is nits;⁷⁹ in flies,⁸⁰ grubs; in fleas, grubs egg-like in shape; and from these issues the parent-species is never reproduced, nor is any animal produced at all, but the like nondescripts only.”⁸¹ It is remarkable that this notion, now called heterogenesis or xenogenesis, was held by the first great opponent of spontaneous generation, the Italian Redi. In modern times tapeworms, bladder worms, and flukes were among the latest strongholds of the advocates of xenogenesis.⁸²

Closely related to spontaneous generation is the belief in showers of animals. The *locus classicus* on this subject is, perhaps, Athenaeus, 333 a-b. He describes an uninterrupted three days' rain of fish and a deluge of frogs that can be compared only to the plague of frogs in Egypt. On one occasion a rain of frogs took place at Naples (Ael. II, 56). On still another occasion so many frogs fell that they caused a tribe to migrate (*ib.* XVII, 41). After a hailstorm at Thebes mice were seen upon the land (*ib.* II, 56). Mice were born whenever it rained in Egypt with light drops (*ib.* VI, 41). Plutarch, *Symp.* IV, 2, 1, pokes fun at people who believe that a shower breeds snails instead of making them creep forth where they may be seen.⁸³

⁷⁸ For instance, butterflies were supposed to originate from caterpillars, *H.A.* 551 a 13 (cf. *Ath.* VIII, 352 f).

⁷⁹ Lice, fleas, and bugs produce nits, *H.A.* 556 b 22 (cf. *G.A.* 732 b 10-14, 758 b 7-28, *Pl.* x, 189-190).

⁸⁰ Cf. *G.A.* 721 a 8, 723 b 5.

⁸¹ Cf. *H.A.* 556 b, *Ath.* VIII, 352 f, *Pl.* x, 190. In the *Iliad*, XIX, 25-27. flies enter wounds and beget maggots.

⁸² See *Scientific Memoirs of Thomas Henry Huxley*, III, 577 f.

⁸³ For modern instances of rains of small toads and fishworms, see *Journ. of Am. Folk-Lore*, XXXI, 10.

When we pass beyond the pagan period, we find the Christian Fathers making use of these old beliefs to defend the tenet of the virgin birth of Christ. Lactantius, *Inst.* I, 8, 7-8, quoting Vergil, writes as follows: Quid igitur sexu opus est femineo, cum Deus, qui est omnipotens, sine usu et opera feminae possit filios procreare? Nam si minutis animalibus (*i.e.* apibus) id praestitit ut sibi *e foliis natos et suavis herbis ore legant* (*Geor.* IV, 200), cur existimet aliquis ipsum Deum, nisi ex permixtione sexus alterius, non posse generare?⁸⁴ The Fathers called attention to the supposed facts that mares conceived from the wind (*Aug. Civ. Dei*, XXI, 5) and that vultures were all females. They reminded their pagan critics that Perseus was virgin-born, that the phoenix was reborn *sine coniuge*, that Minerva sprang full-grown from the head of Zeus, Aphrodite from the sea foam, Castor and Pollux from an egg, the Myrmidons from ants, and a crop of men from the stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha.⁸⁵

These old beliefs had their effect likewise on St. Augustine's notions about the animals in the ark. He says that it would have been unnecessary for Noah to preserve in the ark any creatures that were born from corruption⁸⁶ (*Civ. Dei*, XV, 27). He tells us likewise that as *muli et mulae* do not have offspring, it is not strange if they were not represented in the ark. Eustathius Africanus⁸⁷ explains the text, "Let the earth bring forth," by rehearsing at length time-honored notions of spontaneous generation.

In the age of the microscope the ancient views about the origin and perpetuation of some forms of animal life seem ridiculous, yet they were shared by the learned men of antiquity, persisted throughout the Middle Ages, and may still be found among the uninformed. Within the last two hundred years we find the belief prevailing that barnacles on ships

⁸⁴ Cf. Rufinus, *Comm. in Symb. Apost.* 74 (Migne, XXI, 350).

⁸⁵ Migne, *l.c.*

⁸⁶ After the great flood of classical tradition, all forms of life below man were restored by spontaneous generation (*Ov. Met.* I, 416-437; cf. *Mela*, I, 9).

⁸⁷ *Bas. Hex.* IX, 2 (XXX, 959 C Migne).

become geese when broken off, that certain shellfish growing on trees fall into the water and become brant geese or tree geese,⁸⁸ that pickerel weed and eelgrass produce pickerel and eels,⁸⁹ that the nematode worm originates from horsehairs,⁹⁰ that carcasses generate maggots, etc.

The men who finally challenged the theory of spontaneous generation were confronted with vigorous opposition from doubting scientists, who, as one demonstration after another was given of the natural origin of animal life, still affirmed the validity of the old doctrine for the next lower order. In 1668 the Italian Redi made the first attack on the theory. By the simple device of protecting meat from flies by netting, he proved that maggots do not originate spontaneously. He was inclined to believe that all visible forms of life originated from life, a fact that his successors established.

The revelation of microscopic infusorial life and the discovery of oxygen with the realization of its part in sustaining life ushered in new epochs in the investigation. Pasteur was finally dragged into the discussion about 1860, and in 1864 before a brilliant audience at the Sorbonne demonstrated that the air was the source of the organisms that were developed in infusions. Soon after, the work of the physicist, Professor John Tyndall, who used optically pure air in his tests, concluded two centuries of experimental refutation of the theory of spontaneous generation.⁹¹ After these experiments the conservatives took the only position left to them, that life arises spontaneously in ultra-microscopic particles. As late as 1912, in another presidential address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, we find the statement that we can by no means be sure that the evolution of

⁸⁸ Brand's *Popular Antiquities*, 779.

⁸⁹ Schmucker, *op. cit.* 159-160.

⁹⁰ *Journ. of Am. Folk-Lore*, XXXI, 9.

⁹¹ For a readily accessible summary of the history of the experimentation which led to the overthrow of the hypothesis of the ancients, see John Tyndall, "Spontaneous Generation," *Pop. Sc. Monthly*, XII (1878), 476-488; 591-604. See also W. A. Locy, *Biology and its Makers*, 277-293.

non-living substance into living may not be happening still.⁹²

It is hoped that this paper will fill out for biologists the initial chapter in the history of spontaneous generation, and, at the same time, prove of permanent value to the ever increasing number of students of folklore.⁹³

⁹² Schaefer, "The Nature, Origin and Maintenance of Life," *Science*, xxxvi, 297.

⁹³ To keep the paper within reasonable limits, I have refrained from discussing the spontaneous generation of plants. Many illustrations of it can be found in Theophr. *H.P.*

IX. — *The Worship of Augustus in Italy during His Lifetime*

BY PROFESSOR LILY ROSS TAYLOR

VASSAR COLLEGE

AUGUSTUS' attitude toward receiving divine honors is most fully explained by Cassius Dio. According to his account Roman citizens of the Orient were commanded, early in Augustus' reign, to worship at temples that were erected to the goddess Roma and the deified Julius, but natives of the East were allowed to establish precincts to Augustus, the earliest founded being the shrine of the province of Asia at Pergamum and that of Bithynia at Nicomedia. "This practice," Dio goes on to say, "beginning under him has been continued under the other emperors, not only in the case of the Hellenic nations but also in that of all the others, in so far as they are subject to the Romans. For in the capital itself and in Italy generally no emperor, however worthy of renown he has been, has dared to do this; still even there various divine honors are bestowed after their death upon such emperors as have ruled uprightly, and in fact shrines are built to them."¹

The distinction that Dio makes in the worship of the living emperor between Rome and the provinces, between Romans who were unfamiliar with such practice and Orientals who from the time of Alexander had been in the habit of deifying their rulers, is borne out by literary and inscriptional references to the imperial cult under Augustus. But against Dio's statement that Augustus was not accorded divine honors in Italy before his death there can be cited a mass of inscrip-

¹ Dio, II, 20. The translations from Dio are quoted from Cary's excellent version in the Loeb Classical Library. On Augustus' attitude toward worship of his person compare Suetonius' less detailed statement (*Aug.* 52): *Templa quamvis sciret etiam proconsulibus decerni solere in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit, nam in urbe quidem pertinacissime abstinuit hoc honore.*

tional evidence which proves that temples and priests of Augustus existed in municipalities of Italy before 14 A.D. Such evidence provides justification for the charge which Tacitus says men made against Augustus immediately after his death (*Ann.* I, 10): *Nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet.*

It is the purpose of this paper to consider the evidence for the cult of Augustus in Italian municipalities during his lifetime and to determine if possible how widespread it was and what was its origin and character. The discussion will be limited to such records as seem to indicate the actual worship of the living Emperor. Such auxiliary forms of the imperial cult in municipalities as the worship of Fortuna Redux and of Pax Augusta will be reserved for a future study in which I hope to consider fully the dated evidence for all forms of the imperial cult under Augustus.²

Dated inscriptions attest the existence of priests, temples, and altars of Augustus, during his lifetime, at the twelve following Italian cities: Neapolis, Pompeii, Cumae, Puteoli, Beneventum, Terracina, Praeneste, Pisae, Perusia, Verona, Pola, and Aquileia. At Pola, Terracina, and perhaps elsewhere the goddess Roma was associated with Augustus in the cult, a fact that betrays the influence of the provincial cult of Roma and Augustus.³

The earliest dated evidence for the worship comes from the year 2 B.C., when the senate at Rome gave permission for games to be instituted in Augustus' honor at Neapolis. Here again Dio's account is instructive. After speaking of the

² The most recent detailed treatment of the cult under Augustus is Heinen's article, "Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultus," *Klio*, XI (1911), 129-177, where there are full citations of the earlier literature. Heinen's dates must be used with great caution. Cf. also Warde Fowler, *Roman Ideas of Deity*, 123-129; J. S. Reid, *Journal of Roman Studies*, VI (1916), 176 f.

³ At Verona the cult seems originally to have been directed toward Augustus alone, but later to have included Roma. The games called 'Ρωμαῖα Σεβαστά may indicate an association of Roma with the cult in Neapolis, especially since in the Eastern provinces the goddess shared in the honors of the games on which the Neapolitan celebration was modelled.

celebration at the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor he continues (LV, 10): "These were the celebrations in honor of Mars. To Augustus himself a sacred contest was voted in Neapolis, the Campanian city, nominally because he had restored it when it was prostrated by earthquake and fire, but in reality because its inhabitants alone of the Campanians tried in a manner to imitate the customs of the Greeks." With the institution of these games, whose thoroughly Hellenic character is confirmed by a statement of Strabo⁴ and by the fact that all the records are in Greek,⁵ a temple seems to have been established. Certainly there was later such a temple, to which, according to a fragmentary record, a sacred procession made its way (Dittenberger-Purgold, *l.c.*, line 48). In any case there can be no doubt that the games that were held every four years at Neapolis accompanied the worship of Augustus. Their very name, Ἰταλικά Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ Ἰσολύμπια, shows that they were modelled not only on the Olympic Games but on such festivals as the Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ celebrated every four years at the provincial temple of Roma and Augustus in Pergamum.⁶

After the year 3-2 B.C. and apparently not very long thereafter, dates the earliest occurrence of the title *sacerdos Augusti* at Pompeii.⁷ At about the same time the temple of Roma

⁴ Strabo, v, 4, 7; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 98, *Claud.* 11; Vell. II, 123, 1; Dio, LVI, 29.

⁵ *Inscr. Gr. ad res Rom. pertin.* I, 447-449; Dittenberger-Purgold, *In-schriften von Olympia*, 56; *C.I.L.* XII, 3232.

⁶ *C.I.L.* III, 7086; Dittenberger, *Sylloge*³, 1065; *Orientis gr. inscr. sel.* 458, l. 59. Games held every four years in Augustus' honor were established early in his reign at Mytilene and Epidaurus also. For a fuller discussion of the Neapolitan games see Civitelli, *Atti dell'Accademia di Arch. Napol.* xvii (1894); Wissowa, *Woch. kl. Phil.* xiv (1897), 763-770.

⁷ The inscriptions of M. Holconius Rufus, the first priest of Augustus at Pompeii (*C.I.L.* x, 830, 837, 838, 947, 948), all designa tehim as *duumvir* for the fourth time, an office he is known to have held in 3-2 B.C. Heinen is wrong in dating these inscriptions in the year when Holconius held the office, for the title serves simply as a *terminus post quem*. Since Holconius seems to have held the priesthood for some time and yet was succeeded by M. Holconius Celer before Augustus' death (cf. *C.I.L.* x, 840, 943, 944), it is likely that the earliest inscriptions are not much later than 2 B.C. It is also noteworthy that

and Augustus seems to have been erected at Pola.⁸ An Augusteum is mentioned at Pisae in 2 A.D., and a *flamen Augustalis* two years later.⁹ At Cumae a calendar of festivals to be celebrated in honor of Augustus and his house, providing for the sacrifice of a victim to the Emperor on his birthday, was set up, perhaps in a temple of Augustus, between 4 A.D. and 14 A.D.¹⁰ At Aquileia an altar was erected to Augustus a few months before his death in 14 A.D.¹¹

To this evidence, all of which dates between 2 B.C. and 14 A.D., must be added a number of other inscriptions which, though not definitely dated, certainly belong to the Emperor's lifetime. These record a temple of Augustus at Puteoli,¹² a temple of Roma and Augustus at Terracina,¹³ a Caesareum at

the earliest dated case of the well-known *ministri Augusti* of Pompeii belongs to the year 2 B.C. But the general belief that this title is a later development of the earlier term *minister Mercurii Maiaie* has been shown by Bormann to lack foundation. Cf. *Wiener Eranos*, 1909, 315 f. The exact relation of the *ministri Augusti* to the imperial cult is still obscure; they may perhaps be associated with the Augustales or with the officials in charge of the cult of the Lares Compitales.

⁸ The inscription on the epistyle of the temple now standing there is, *Romae et Augusto Caesari divi f. patri patriae* (*C.I.L.* v, 18). The prominence given to the title *pater patriae* which stands alone in the second line suggests that the temple was erected soon after the title was conferred in 2 B.C.

⁹ *C.I.L.* xi, 1420, line 1, records a meeting of the *decuriones* of Pisae *in foro in Augusteo* in 2 A.D. This is the earliest certainly dated monument of the cult. *C.I.L.* xi, 1421, records a *flamen Augustalis* in 4 A.D.

¹⁰ *C.I.L.* i, pt. 1², p. 229 (= *C.I.L.* x, 3682) with Mommsen's commentary. Cf. also Mommsen, *Herm.* xvii (1882), 631-643 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, iv, 259-270). Bormann, *Arch.-epig. Mitth.* xix (1896), 115 ff., notes that there is no actual proof for the statement frequently made that this festival list belonged to a temple of Augustus.

¹¹ *C.I.L.* v, 852: *Imp. Caesari divi f. Augusto pontf. maxim. trib. potest. xxxvii cos. xiii p. p. sacrum*. The word *sacrum* seems to indicate that the dedication belonged to an altar set up to Augustus. This inscription does not, however, conclusively prove an official municipal cult.

¹² *C.I.L.* x, 1613: [*L. C*]alpornius *L. f. templum Augusto cum ornamentis d. s. f.* Pelham, *Essays on Roman History*, 109, n. 9, cites the interesting case in Suet. *Aug.* 98 of Alexandrian sailors at Puteoli making offerings to Augustus as he was sailing past the city.

¹³ *C.I.L.* x, 6305: *Romae et Augusto Caesari divi [f.] A. Aemilius A. f. ex pecunia sua f. c.*

Beneventum,¹⁴ a sacred grove and precinct at Perusia,¹⁵ and priests of Augustus at Verona¹⁶ and Praeneste.¹⁷

I have not included in this list Fanum Fortunae in Umbria, where Vitruvius' statement (v, 1, 7) that he arranged the columns of his basilica "ne impediunt aspectus pronai aedis augusti," has been thought to provide evidence for another temple of Augustus. The difficulties of the passage are great. Elsewhere in the *de Architectura* the Emperor is addressed simply as Imperator Caesar and there is no other passage in the treatise which need date later than 30 B.C.¹⁸ As Sontheimer¹⁹ has ably shown, the usual interpretation of the passage is impossible. Krohn in the introduction to his text of Vitruvius (Teubner, 1912) has given strong reasons for regarding the entire description of the basilica as spurious.

Hirschfeld,²⁰ Rushforth,²¹ Richter,²² Heinen,²³ and others

¹⁴ *C.I.L.* ix, 1556: P. Veidius P. f. Pollio Caesareum imp. Caesari Augusto et coloniae Beneventanae. The Publius Veidius Pollio who erected the temple here styled Caesareum has been identified with the wealthy Roman knight Vedius Pollio, of whom Dio, lrv, 23, gives an interesting account on the occasion of his death in 15 B.C. But there is nothing besides the name to prove the identity.

¹⁵ *C.I.L.* xi, 1922: Augusto lucus sacer; 1923 (four *cippi*, each bearing the inscription): Augusto sacr. Perusia restituta.

¹⁶ *C.I.L.* v, 3341, which records a flamen Aug. primo Veron. creatus, apparently an early form of the priesthood that later had the title *flamen Romae et Augusti* in Verona.

¹⁷ *C.I.L.* xiv, 2964. Although Dessau here questions Foggini's reading, *flamen Caesaris Augusti*, there seems to be no adequate reason to reject it. It is possible that Nola should be added to this list. In that town was found an altar with the inscription (x, 1238), Augusto sacrum restituerunt Laurinienses pecunia sua cultores d. d. The dedication seems, however, to belong rather to some organization of freedmen than to an official town cult. On the altar is said to be represented along with various sacrificial implements an attendant who carries an axe and leads a cow. It seems possible that the descriptions are wrong and that the victim is a bull, the usual sacrifice to the emperor.

¹⁸ Cf. Schanz, *Röm. Literaturgesch.* II, 1³, 537 f.

¹⁹ Sontheimer, *Vitruvius und seine Zeit* (Tübingen, 1908), 100-104. See also M. H. Morgan, *Addresses and Essays*, 238, note.

²⁰ *Sitzungsber. d. Berliner Akad.* xxxv (1888), 838 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 477 f.).

²¹ *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, 51-58.

²² Roscher's *Lexikon*, s. v. *Roma*. Richter's references for the cult of Roma and Augustus in Italy are unreliable.

²³ *L.c.*, especially the list of *Priester, Tempeln, und Altäre des lebenden Augustus*

give much longer lists of the towns where Augustus was worshipped as a god before his death, but they include towns where the titles *flamen Augusti* or *Augustalis* and *flamen Romae et Augusti* occur. They apparently base their action on the belief that these titles indicate the worship of the first Augustus and belong to a cult instituted before his death, while priests of his cult established later would be called *flamen divi Augusti* or *flamen Romae et divi Augusti*. This view is disproved by inscriptions of Pompeii where Marcus Holconius Celer is called *sacerdos Augusti* before 14 A.D. and *sacerdos divi Augusti* after that date. He continued to devote himself to Augustus' cult after the Emperor's death, but in order to do so he had to change his title to fit the Emperor's new divine status.²⁴ Moreover Toutain and Geiger have conclusively shown that both in the provincial and in the municipal cult the titles *flamen* (or *sacerdos*) *Augusti*, *flamen Romae et Augusti*, and even the simple title *flamen* refer not to the cult of the first emperor, but to the cult of the living emperor whoever he might be.²⁵ Similarly, as Geiger has shown, the title *flaminica* denotes a priestess of the living empress.

The importance of these facts, abundantly demonstrated by the cases that Toutain and Geiger cite, has not been generally recognized. Yet it has great bearing on our discussion, not only in diminishing the dated evidence for the cult in Augustus' lifetime, but also in disproving the statement frequently made that the worship of the living emperor

²⁴ The inscriptions C.I.L. x, 840, 943, 944 date before Augustus' death; 945 and 946 are later.

²⁵ For the provinces and for provincial towns see Toutain, *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, I, 43-51, where the most convincing evidence is provided by the inscriptions of the shrine of the three Gauls. One of the priests of this cult bears the title *sac[er]d[os] ad templ[um] Rom[ae] et Auggg. trium prov[inciarum] [G]all[iarum]*, C.I.L. XIII, 1691. The erasure of the third g of *Auggg*, can leave no doubt that this inscription refers to Septimus Severus, Geta, and Caracalla. The applicability of the same general principle to all municipalities is demonstrated by Geiger, *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipalibus* (Halle, 1913), 14-18. For the simple title *flamen*, cf. Geiger, 21-23.

was peculiar to the reign of the first Augustus.²⁶ Many of the inscriptions recording the titles *flamen*, *flamen Augusti*, etc., are undeniably post-Augustan, and a number of them can be definitely dated in the reign of later emperors. Thus a *flamen Augustalis* of Venafrum (x, 4868) belongs to the reign of Tiberius, two *flamines Romae et Augusti* of Luna to Nero (xi, 1331, 6955), a *flamen Aug(usti)* of Libarna (v, 7425) to Nerva, and a *flamen Augustalis* of Reate (ix, 4686) to Commodus. To these cases showing the cult of the living emperor at a later period may be added priests of a particular emperor who is not designated as *divus*. For Tiberius such priests are known at Venusia (ix, 652) and Surrentum (x, 688), for Claudius at Pompeii (iv, 1180) and Puteoli (x, 1558), for Trajan and Hadrian at Sassina (xi, 6505) and Tergeste (v, 545). The evidence shows that even Tiberius, the emperor who was most determined not to receive divine honors before his death,²⁷ was worshipped in Italian municipalities during his lifetime.

This worship of the living emperor is attested by records of temples and priests in more than sixty towns in all parts of Italy.²⁸ It was not, as we have seen, peculiar to the first

²⁶ Cf. for instance Mommsen, *Herm.* xvii (1882), 641, where it is suggested that Tiberius must have been particularly effective in curtailing this worship.

²⁷ Suet. *Tib.* 26; Dio, lvii, 8-9.

²⁸ In addition to the four places already mentioned the cult of Roma and Augustus is attested by records of temples at Ulubrae and Ostia and of priests at Ostia, Luna, and Tridentum. An Augusteum is recorded at the Etruscan Ferentum (*Notiz. Scav.* 1911, 23). *Flamines Augusti* or *Augustales* (or in rare cases *sacerdotes*) not previously mentioned are known at the following towns: Pompeii, Venafrum, Ardea, Aesernia, Peltuinum, Aveia, Reate, Falerio, Clusium, Urvinum Hortense, Ateste, Cremona, Libarna, Camunni, Pola (*C.I.L.* v, 47, where the title is *flamen Augustor(um)*), and three unknown towns (*C.I.L.* xiv, 3500, 3590; v, 5511). The title *flamen* is known at the following towns: Locri, Nola, Venafrum, Ferentinum, Ostia, Gabii, Nomentum, Castrimoenium, Aeclanum*, Aesernia*, Lupiae, Pinna*, Teruentum, Veii, Tifernum Metaurense, Urvinum Metaurense, Forum Sempronii, Mutina, Ariminum, Brixia, Feltria, Parentium, Aquileia, Concordia*, Acelum, Bellunum, Arusnates, Mediolanum, Vercelli, Genua, Dertona, and an unknown town (v, 6480). The evidence for towns that are marked with an asterisk is based on inscriptions in which the titles are fragmentary.

Augustus. Even under him it was not confined, as Hirschfeld believed (*l.c.*), to towns that enjoyed his special patronage; nor was it, as Nissen thought (*Pompeianische Studien*, 182 f.), a cult established by private individuals; nor finally, as Ferguson has argued (*Am. Hist. Rev.* XVIII [1912-1913], 45 f.), a cult mainly followed by slaves and freedmen. It was probably established under Augustus in every municipality and colony of Italy and in many towns of the Western provinces. With its public priests chosen from the chief citizens of the towns,²⁹ its temples in the municipal fora,³⁰ its calendar of festivals to be celebrated, it bears all the marks of an official cult that enjoyed imperial sanction and support. Yet as in other municipal institutions there was no insistence on absolute uniformity in the cult. Sometimes, as was regularly the case in the provincial cult, the goddess Roma was worshipped with the emperor, though more often she was not. Sometimes the priest was called a *sacerdos*, more often a *flamen*. His title might be the more general one of *flamen Augusti* (or *Augustalis*) or a more definite one that indicated his association with a particular emperor.³¹

How then are we to reconcile this cult of the living emperor with Dio's statement that in Rome and in Italy generally no emperor, however renowned, had dared to make himself a god before his death? This is a subject on which Dio, a Roman consular with a first-hand knowledge of Roman institutions, might be expected to know whereof he spoke, and, in spite of the general belief to the contrary, I think he did know. For, except perhaps in the case of the Greek city Neapolis, the cult that our inscriptions record was, I believe,

²⁹ On the status of these priests see Geiger, *op. cit.* 60 f.

³⁰ The temple of Roma and Augustus at Pola stands in the forum of the ancient city, and the inscription *C.I.L.* XI, 1420, shows that the same thing was true of the Augusteum of Pisae. The Augusteum of Ferentum seems also to have been in the forum.

³¹ For the independence of individual municipalities in the observance of this cult compare Mommsen's comments, *op. cit.* 640, on the festivals listed in the calendar from Cumae.

directed not toward the emperor himself but toward his genius.

Let us consider in this connection the evidence for the origin of the cult of the emperor's genius at Rome. As early as the year 30 B.C. the senate voted that at all banquets, both public and private, a libation be poured to Octavian's genius.³² In 13 B.C. — probably, as Mommsen has shown,³³ by decree of the senate — the genius of Augustus seems to have been included among the official cults of the Roman state. Horace refers in poems of that year to the two forms which the new cult assumed, first to the inclusion of Augustus' genius in the official form of oath,³⁴ and second to the introduction of the Genius Augusti into the newly organized cult of the Lares Compitales, who from now on were identified with the Lares Augusti.³⁵ This cult, abundantly known from inscriptions of Rome and elsewhere and from shrines at practically every street crossing in Pompeii, is attested first at Rome in 12 B.C.; its complete reorganization dates, as both Dio's statement and inscriptional evidence prove, from 7 B.C.³⁶

Further evidence for the cult of the genius is found in the numerous sacrifices to that divinity which are recorded in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*. There is a significance which has not been fully recognized in the places where these sacrifices occurred. They were held either on the Capitol where victims were at the same time offered to Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, perhaps at the same altar with which official oaths were associated, or, less often, in the Forum Augustum where

³² Dio, LI, 19, 7. Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, II, 637 f.; Hor. *Carm.* IV, 5, 31-35.

³³ *Herm.* XV (1880), 107-109 (= *Gesammelte Schriften*, VII, 179-181).

³⁴ *Epist.* II, 1, 15-16. The oath had previously been taken by Juppiter Optimus Maximus and the Di Penates. Later the deified emperors were included in the oath which under Domitian read: per Iovem et divom Augustum et divom Claudium et divom Vespasianum Augustum et divom Titum Augustum et genium imp(eratoris) Caesaris Domitiani Augusti deosque penates (*C.I.L.* II, 1963; cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II³, 809, n. 5).

³⁵ *Carm.* IV, 5, 33-35.

³⁶ Dio, LV, 8. For a summary of the evidence for the cult see Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², 172 ff.

at the same time a victim was offered to Mars Ultor, whose temple stood in that Forum.³⁷ On the Capitol the deified emperors were sometimes included in the sacrifice as they were later included in the official oath, though usually the temple of the deified Augustus on the Palatine was the scene of sacrifice to them. In the Forum of Augustus the only divinities honored were Mars Ultor and the genius of the ruler.³⁸ So far as I know the significance of this combination has never been pointed out. Mars Ultor was not simply the god who avenged Caesar's death. As the father of Romulus he was also the father of the Julian house, just as Venus Genetrix, whose statue stood beside his in the temple, was the mother of the same house.³⁹ These two divinities would thus naturally typify the male and female procreative power of the family. With the father of the Julian house it was natural to associate the emperor's genius, the divinity that, as the connection of the word with *gignere* shows, personified

³⁷ Until the reign of Nero the fragmentary records of the Arval Brethren show sacrifices to the deified Augustus but none to the genius of the reigning emperor; this fact does not, however, indicate that such sacrifices were not performed by other officials or priests at an earlier period. For the evidence see Henzen, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, *passim*.

³⁸ Henzen, *op. cit.* p. LXXV, ll. 29 and 37 (59 A.D.); p. LXXXVI, 1 (reign of Nero); XCIV, 88 (69 A.D.); XCIV, 5; XCVI, 18 (both restored, 69 A.D.). These sacrifices all belong to the time of Nero and of Vitellius, a period when the *Acta* are preserved in considerable detail. Perhaps the sacrifices at this temple may have ceased after the Julian house came to an end. Vitellius, who entered upon his rule holding in his hand the sword of the deified Julius which had been taken from the temple of Mars Ultor (Suet. *Vit.* 8), may have wished to keep up the connection. Later Mars was sometimes included in the sacrifices held on the Capitol. Little can be learned from the special occasions on which the sacrifices were held in the Forum of Augustus. They were made twice *pro salute et reditu Neronis*; once *ob diem imperii* under Vitellius (an occasion on which the sacrifice to the genius is made on the Capitol under Nero; cf. the incident related from Suetonius above); again under the same emperor *pro salute et adventu imperatoris*. In two other instances the occasion is not clear.

³⁹ Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, v, 549-598; *Trist.* II, 296. It is noteworthy that the calendar from Cumae records a *supplicatio* to Mars Ultor and Venus Genetrix on Caesar's birthday. See Wissowa's comments, *op. cit.* 292.

the male procreative force⁴⁰ and accordingly suggested the continuance of the race. It is significant that the victim regularly sacrificed both to Mars and to the emperor's genius was a bull, while a castrated animal such as the ox or the wether, a much more usual type of victim in Roman ritual, was always offered to deified emperors.⁴¹

Moreover it is noteworthy that the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated in 2 B.C., a year signaled not only by the institution of the Neapolitan games but also by the fact that the senate then bestowed upon Augustus the title *pater patriae*. This new title, conferred at a time when the popularity of his grandsons Lucius and Gaius made the Emperor most confident that his dynasty would continue, suggests a natural association between Augustus the father of his country and Mars the father of Augustus and of the whole Julian race.⁴² This connection seems to have been in Ovid's mind when in 1 B.C., as Lucius was about to depart for the East, he wrote the following prayer for the youth:

Marsque pater Caesarque pater date numen eunti
Nam deus e vobis alter es, alter eris.⁴³

As *principes iuventutis*, the first holders of the title that was henceforth to be the special prerogative of the heirs to the succession, Gaius and Lucius were closely associated with the new temple. This title made them the special patrons of the *iuvenes*, a term that under Augustus was used in a semi-technical sense to refer to the boys of senatorial and

⁴⁰ Cf. Warde Fowler, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 30; Wissowa, *op. cit.* 175. For another view see Otto in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. *Genius*.

⁴¹ Wissowa, *op. cit.* 412 f. A cursory examination of the sacrificial scenes reproduced in Reinach's *Répertoire des reliefs grecs et romains* shows that the bull is by far the most frequent victim in such scenes. Many of them seem to belong to the cult of the emperor's genius. See my discussion of the altar of Manlius in the Lateran, soon to appear in the *American Journal of Archaeology*.

⁴² In several cases where the emperor's genius is addressed, *pater patriae* is the only title used. Cf. Petr. *Sat.* 60; Ovid, *Fasti*, II, 637; *C.I.L.* XI, 3593.

⁴³ *A.A.* I, 203 f. In an inscription from Athens (*I.G.* III, 444 a) Gaius is addressed as the son of Ares.

equestrian rank between the ages of fifteen and seventeen. These youths were enrolled at Rome for a period of preliminary military training before they were sent to the provinces.⁴⁴ It was natural for the *iuvenes* to have a special connection with the new temple, the place where governors were henceforth to sacrifice on departing for their provinces and where the spoils of war were hereafter to be dedicated (Dio, LV, 10). Such a connection is shown by the provision, which Dio reports, that boys were henceforth to go there, presumably to sacrifice, when they assumed the *toga virilis* — an occasion on which hitherto sacrifices seem to have been made only on the Capitol.⁴⁵ It is further shown by the fact that every year there were to be held at this temple special games of the *iuvenes*, the Ludi Sevirales, directed by the *seviri equitum Romanorum*.

There is then reason to believe that with the establishment of the temple of Mars Ultor, a shrine with which both the past and the future of the reigning dynasty were intimately associated,⁴⁶ sacrifices were instituted to the genius of the Emperor, a deity that was looked upon as the perpetuating

⁴⁴ Cf. Rostowzew's excellent discussion of the *iuvenes* in his study of "Römische Bleitesserae," *Klio*, Beiheft III (1905), 59-93.

⁴⁵ Dio, LV, 10 . . . "Ἀρρὲι, ἑαυτὸν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους, ὅσῳκις ἂν ἐθελήσωσι, τοὺς τε ἐκ τῶν παίδων ἐξιόντας καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἐφήβους ἐγγραφομένους ἐκεῖσε πάντως ἀφικνεῖσθαι. See Rostowzew's comments on this passage, *op. cit.* 67.

Practically all the handbooks state that Augustus provided that princes of the imperial house should sacrifice at the temple of Mars Ultor when they assumed the *toga virilis*, but apparently the only authority for the belief is this passage — unfortunately fragmentary — which certainly does not limit the statement to the princes of the imperial family. Numerous references show that sacrifices continued to be made on the Capitol when the *toga virilis* was taken; that such was the case even for the imperial house is shown by Suet. *Claud.* 2, for Claudius, who, however, can hardly be regarded as a typical imperial prince. It is possible that a shrine of Iuventas may have existed in this temple as well as on the Capitol. In this connection see Warde Fowler's interesting comments on the significance of the combination 'Iuventas, Hercules, Genius,' in relation to the *iuvenes* (*op. cit.* 332, n. 12).

⁴⁶ Among the statues of famous men that adorned the Forum of Augustus where this temple stood there were numerous ancestors of the Julian house (cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, v, 563 f., and Huelsen's comments, *C.I.L.* I, pt. 1², p. 187).

force of the house. Several years before, at a time when the Emperor's plans for the succession were less definite, sacrifices to his genius had probably been begun on the Capitol, and the subsequent institution of similar ceremonies at the temple of Mars Ultor is one more evidence of Augustus' determination to give to the new temple rights and prerogatives that had hitherto belonged to the Capitolium alone.⁴⁷

It is with this cult of the ruler's genius that I would associate the temples and priests of the living emperors that from 2 B.C. begin to appear in Italian municipalities. It may be objected at the outset that the word *genius* would be expected in the name of temples and priests. But that word was by no means always used in the cult. When at Trimalchio's dinner the emperor's genius was honored, what the guests said was simply, "*Augusto patri patriae feliciter.*"⁴⁸

Here as on many another point of municipal organization the ruins and records of Pompeii provide important evidence. We have seen that the inscriptions there record priests of Augustus both before and after his death, and a priest of Claudius at a later period. The temple where the cult of the living emperor was observed should be in the forum, as were for instance the Augusteum in Pisae and the temple of Roma and Augustus in Pola. Now there is on the east side of the forum at Pompeii a small temple with a large forecourt. In the centre of the court directly in front of the temple is a four-sided marble altar with a sacrificial scene in relief on the front. A civic crown and laurel branches on the altar indicate a connection with an emperor, and the sacrificial scene in which a bull and not an ox is the victim shows that the emperor was living and that accordingly the offering was made to his genius. Earlier students of Pompeii called this the

⁴⁷ See again Dio, LV, 10, for the rules that governed the temple of Mars Ultor.

⁴⁸ Petr. *Sat.* 60; cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, II, 637. It is probable that the *Augusto feliciter* of numerous painted inscriptions of Pompeii refers to the emperor's genius; cf. *C.I.L.* IV, 427, 1084, 2460, 528, 820 a, 1074, 1612, 3525, 3726.

temple of the Genius of Augustus and assigned to it a fragmentary dedication of unknown provenience, addressed apparently to the Genius Augusti.⁴⁹ Mau, however, pointed out that, since the whole structure seems to have been built after the earthquake of 63, the temple ought rather to be assigned to a later emperor. For a number of reasons he decided on Vespasian, adding the statement, "As this emperor possessed too great simplicity of character to allow men to worship him as a god while he was still alive, [the temple] was probably dedicated to his genius."⁵⁰

Only after a thorough reconsideration of the criteria for dating Pompeian monuments⁵¹ would it be possible to determine whether Mau's dating of this temple after 63 and his statement that no previous shrine existed on the spot are correct. But whatever the date of temple and altar,⁵² the essential thing is that the victim shows that the altar belongs to the cult of the emperor's genius and that neither at Pompeii nor anywhere else in the Roman world is there any record of temple or priest to whose title is attached the name of an emperor's genius. It is needless to search further in the forum of Pompeii for the temple at which the *sacerdos Augusti* performed his duties. This is undoubtedly the *templum Augusti*, the shrine of the living emperor whoever he might be; here on the emperor's birthday, the day of all others sacred to the genius, took place the one sacrifice which the

⁴⁹ Cf. Overbeck-Mau, *Pompeii*,⁴ 117. According to Mau the measurements of the inscription (*C.I.L.* x, 816) do not fit the temple, but would fit the wall that separates the courtyard from the forum of Pompeii. The restoration of the inscription is not altogether sure. From comparison with *C.I.L.* x, 998, it seems to belong to an early imperial date.

⁵⁰ Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii*, 109. For a more detailed discussion see Mau, *Atti dell'Accademia Archeologica di Napoli*, xvi (1891-1893), 181-183.

⁵¹ Such an investigation as has enabled Dr. Esther B. Van Deman to put on a new basis the dating of buildings at Rome is much needed for Pompeii.

⁵² On the basis of Mau's association of this temple with Vespasian the altar is usually taken as a typical example of Flavian sculpture. I believe, however, from the style of the reliefs, that it is, if not Augustan, certainly early imperial work.

calendar from Cumae records, the offering of a bull to the genius of the reigning emperor.⁵³

If Mau is correct in believing that this temple was constructed on a new site after the earthquake of 63, it may be that the cult of the living emperor had hitherto been observed in the large shrine next door, which Mau tried to identify as the *Lararium publicum*. There is much more probability in the earlier theory that this building with its numerous niches and places for statues belongs to the imperial cult.⁵⁴ It may originally have been a temple where the deified emperors were worshipped with the genius of the living emperor. The fact already noted that Marcus Holconius Celer, who had been *sacerdos Augusti* before 14 A.D., became *sacerdos divi Augusti* after that date, lends support to the belief that the two forms of the imperial cult were originally combined at Pompeii. A similar combination is attested by the official oath-form and by the titles of various municipal and provincial priests of Spain.⁵⁵ Later, perhaps when the larger shrine was completely rebuilt after the earthquake of 63, it may have been found convenient to effect a separation of the two cults, and at that time the small temple next door may have been built and dedicated to the cult of the living emperor.

There is further evidence of importance from Pompeii in a

⁵³ The entry on this day is as follows: *Natalis Caesaris. Immolatio Caesari hostia, supplicatio.* All the other days on the calendar, which include the birthdays of Tiberius, Drusus, and Germanicus, and twelve days to be celebrated in Augustus' honor, are signalized simply by *supplicationes*.

⁵⁴ Cf. Mau, *Röm. Mitth.* XI (1896), 285-301; Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii*, ch. XIII. The evidence for such shrines of the *Lares publici* is scant in comparison with the material for the imperial cult. Mau's objection that the building is not sufficiently like a temple to have served as a shrine of the emperors does not seem serious. This structure has also been identified as the municipal senate-house, the place where the *decuriones* usually met. In this connection it is noteworthy that the temple of the imperial worship frequently served for that meeting-place. Cf. *C.I.L.* x, 3698 (Cumae), 1784 (Puteoli); xi, 3614 (Caere), 1420 (Pisae); xiv, 353 (Ostia).

⁵⁵ Cf. the title *flamen Romae et divorum et Augustorum* in Barcino (*C.I.L.* II, 4514), and in the province of Hispania Citerior (*C.I.L.* II, 4205, 4222, 4228, 4235), etc. See also Geiger's restoration (*op. cit.* 9) of *C.I.L.* v, 7458.

record of a priest of Nero (*flamen Neronis Caesaris Augusti fili perpetuus*, *C.I.L.* iv, 3884) who held office before the death of Claudius at a time when Nero was regarded as prospective heir to the succession. Evidently the genius of the heir sometimes had a share in the sacrifices made.⁵⁶ Similarly at the altar of the Numen Augustum of Forum Clodii, which must have been established originally before Augustus' death, the genii of both Augustus and Tiberius are honored.⁵⁷

In concluding let us see how Augustus came to introduce and develop the cult of his genius. Early in his reign he had come to understand the value in legalizing his monarchical powers of the divinity with which his Oriental subjects endowed him. Among these subjects, therefore, he encouraged his own worship. But since he realized that the worship of a living man was totally foreign to the Roman manner of thought, he instituted for Roman citizens in the East the cult of the deified Julius, a worship that emphasized his divine origin. That was a form of divinity that he did not hesitate to assume even at Rome. There he fostered the cult of his adoptive father and built magnificent temples to Venus Genetrix and Mars Ultor, the divine ancestors of his house. He styled himself *divi filius* and assumed the title Augustus that, in Professor Warde Fowler's happy phrase, kept constantly before the minds of men "the germ of a deity in him."⁵⁸ From the cult of his house it was a natural step to the worship of his genius, a cult that emphasized not the past but

⁵⁶ One is reminded in this connection of the famous temple to Gaius and Lucius, the *Maison Carrée*, erected at Nemausus earlier, many authorities think, than the death of either of Augustus' grandsons. Cf. *C.I.L.* xii, 3156, and Beaudouin's discussion, "Le culte des empereurs dans la Gaule Narbonnaise," in *Annales de l'enseignement supérieur de Grenoble*, III (1891), 94-97.

⁵⁷ *C.I.L.* xi, 3303. The inscription as it stands dates from 18 A.D., but its earlier provisions, which apparently are copied from some decree, seem from the references to Augustus' *genius* and from the use of his name without *divus* to go back to a period before his death. It is interesting to note in this connection a private inscription from Falerii (*C.I.L.* xi, 3076): *Genio Augusti et Ti. Caesaris Iunoni Liviae Mystes l(iberta)*. The Juno of Livia would be a natural accompaniment of the cult of Augustus' genius.

⁵⁸ *Roman Ideas of Deity*, 126.

the future of his race, the divine power that assured the continuance of the blessings which the Julian house had brought to Rome. It is probably not a mere coincidence that the earliest evidence for the provincial cult of Roma and Augustus in the West comes from 12 B.C., the year after the Genius Augusti seems first to have been included among the official state cults. I venture to suggest that the altar of the three Gauls which Augustus' stepson Drusus established in that year near Lugudunum represented, for Roman citizens at least, the worship of the emperor's genius. The non-Roman character of the population, which readily led to the assimilation of Eastern cult forms, might explain why Suetonius and Dio in their comments on the provincial cult note no differences between the Eastern and the Western provinces.⁵⁹

The correspondence in date between the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor and the beginning of the municipal cult of Augustus in Italy, suggests that the extension of the cult of the emperor's genius that seems to have accompanied the establishment of the new temple supplied the model for the municipal cult in Italy, and I may add, in towns of the West-

⁵⁹ It is impossible to deal adequately with the cult in Italy without the evidence for both provincial and municipal cult in the Western provinces. That is a subject which I hope to consider in detail in a later study. Reference must be made to the view of Beaudouin, *op. cit.* 47-50, that the famous altar of the Numen Augusti set up in Narbo in 11 A.D. (*C.I.L.* XII, 4333), and the numerous dedications from Gaul, Germany, and Britain to the Numen Augusti, united with various other gods, are all to be referred to the Genius Augusti. Warde Fowler, *op. cit.* 132, takes the same view, but Toutain, *op. cit.* 51-53, strongly opposes the suggestion that *numen* is equivalent to *genius*. I believe that the Numen Augusti was a new form of the cult of the genius, probably associated with the altar of the Numen Augustum established in Rome by Tiberius some time before Augustus' death (cf. *Fasti Praenestini* for Jan. 17, *C.I.L.* I, pt. 1², p. 308). Evidence in support of that view is found in the association of Felicitas with the Numen Augusti in both cases. The entry in the *Fasti Praenestini* reads: N[umini Augusti ad aram q]uam dedicavit Ti. Caesar Fe[llicitat]i q[uod Ti. Caesar aram] Aug. patri dedicavit. Cf. the reference to Augustus' birthday in lines 14-16 of the altar from Narbo: qua die eum saeculi felicitas orbi terrarum rectorem edidit. The altar of Forum Clodii referred to above may be associated with the same cult. Cf. also *C.I.L.* IV, 3882, an inscription referring to gladiatorial games, inscribed to the Numen Augusti by a *flamen Augustalis* of Pompeii.

ern provinces as well. The altar from Pompeii showing imperial emblems and the sacrifice of a bull, the regular victim offered to the genius, indicates the existence of an official municipal cult of the genius over which the priests of Augustus in Pompeii must have presided. Perhaps at Neapolis, the most thoroughly Greek city of Italy, where the Hellenic character of the games in the emperor's honor is abundantly shown, it can be doubted whether the genius was the object of the cult. The Alexandrian sailors who offered incense to Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 98) probably worshipped the Emperor in the Italian town exactly as they did in Alexandria, and the same thing must have been true of many another Easterner who observed this cult in Italy.⁶⁰ But for the official municipal cult in Italy we can believe Dio's statement that no emperor ventured to make himself a god in his lifetime. Whatever the attitude of individual worshippers of Eastern origin, the cult that our inscriptions attest was directed not toward the living emperor but toward the shadowy attendant deity whose function it was to perpetuate his race. Under this form the cult was not peculiar to the first Augustus but continued after his death to be devoted to the living emperor whoever he might be.

There was, however, one marked distinction in the cult between Rome and the municipalities. In Rome the *Genius Augusti* had no special temples or priests but was worshipped at the shrines of other divinities and was under the care of priesthoods that already existed. In the municipalities the *Genius* had an independent cult, with priests whose title *flamen* betrays the importance of sacrifice among their duties and with temples constructed in honor of the living Emperor. These are the features of the worship that justify Tacitus' sharp comment, which I do not hesitate to refer to the municipal cult: *Nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet.* For Tacitus at least the genius was but a thin disguise.

⁶⁰ In this number are perhaps to be included the *cultores Augusti qui per omnes domos in modum collegiorum habebantur* (Tac. *Ann.* I, 73).

X. — *The Exposure of Infants at Athens*

BY PROFESSOR LA RUE VAN HOOK

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

THE handbooks and commentaries which treat of Athenian life and society in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. are well-nigh a unit in asserting the great prevalence of the practice of exposing newborn infants. A few representative statements on this subject may be quoted as examples: Glotz,¹ "Dans les temps historiques, cette barbare habitude est universelle. . . . Mais où il paraît surtout en vigueur, c'est à Athènes." So also Legrand.² Wilamowitz,³ "Der Vater hat von dem Rechte, das Neugeborene auszusetzen oder zu töten, starken Gebrauch gemacht. . . . Man kann die Kinderaussetzung nicht leicht überschätzen." Walters,⁴ "It (*i.e. expositio*) was especially common at Athens, as may be gathered from Aristophanes and other writers . . . often it was the father's deliberate act. There appears to have been no better reason in most cases than avoiding the trouble and cost of rearing and education." Gardner and Jevons,⁵ "The father, often, and more frequently if it was a girl, declined this duty (*i.e. rearing the child*), and caused it to be exposed . . . or even ordered it to be put to death." Miss Harrison,⁶ "Public opinion countenanced the exposure of superfluous children. The practice was not infrequent, especially in the case of girls." So also Zimmern⁷ agrees that this "barbarous custom" was very common in Athens: "the father had complete power of selection, and, what is more, it appears that this was frequently exercised, particularly in the case of

¹ Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire*, s. v. *Expositio*.² *The Greek New Comedy*, transl. by Loeb, 280.³ *Staat und Gesellschaft*, 35, where, however, W. is probably not speaking of Athens alone, nor yet of the fifth and fourth centuries merely.⁴ *Class. Dict.*, s. v. *Expositio*.⁵ *Manual of Greek Antiquities*, 298.⁶ In Whibley's *Companion to Greek Studies*.⁷ *The Greek Commonwealth*, 328 ff.

female infants; for the provision of a dowry for his daughters weighed heavily on a Greek father's mind, and what was easier than to evade it by pleading inability at the outset." Robinson,⁸ "Superfluous babies, especially girls, had in Greece but a cold welcome; the truth being that at Sparta, always, and at Athens, not infrequently, they received the shortest of shrifts, being summarily exposed, or as the phrase ran (in days when earthenware was more common than carpetbags) 'potted.' "

At the outset it may be conceded that the exposing of newly born infants regarded as superfluous or undesired was practiced to a greater or lesser degree throughout the Greek world from earliest times. It is also true, I believe, that the practice was by no means unknown to Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. I am of opinion, however, that the arguments presented to prove the great prevalence of the custom in Athens at this period are far from conclusive and are not well supported by the evidence and by actual conditions so far as it is possible for us to know them.

Let us now consider these arguments in detail. Some of the points raised are worthy of serious consideration, while others are ridiculous. A few of the latter may be mentioned first.

It is said that children were not wanted by the Athenians, and that they seem to have been peculiarly sensitive to the thousand little annoyances inevitably entailed by the rearing of children (Glotz, *op. cit.* II, 931). For example, a character in Menander exclaims: "There is no one so unhappy as a father, with one exception, namely, another father who has more children!" (Stob. *Flor.* LXXXVI, 1); and the philosopher Democritus affirms, "To rear children is a hazardous undertaking and success is won through struggle and anxiety" (*ib.* 13). But in spite of the momentary pessimism of a father of wayward offspring in the New Comedy, or the cynical observation of a philosopher, we know that the Athenians

⁸ *The Days of Alkibiades.*

were fond of children and desired them (εὐτεκνία), as many passages in the literature show.⁹ It is asserted that the Athenian father desired one child only and that a son to continue the line; it might be possible at great sacrifice to educate one son; a second son would spell ruin! Ferguson,¹⁰ however, points out that the *Prosopographia* shows clearly that more than one son was commonly raised. Furthermore, the supposedly ruinous cost of education in Athens is an error. The tuition fee for attending elementary school was small; after this stage of instruction, if the father could not afford the tuition charges of the more advanced schools and the instruction provided by sophists and philosophers, formal education was discontinued, and the agora, the ecclesia, the heliastic courts, and the theater provided no mean substitutes. One might further ask what assurance the Athenian father would have for the continuance of his line and the happiness and welfare of his old age, in an era, too, when a high death rate existed and wars were rife, if only one son of those born to him was reared.

The comedian Posidippus of the third century B.C. humorously says (Kock, III, p. 338): "One rears a son even if one be poor, but exposes a daughter even if one be rich." It is true that the birth of a girl was not as welcome in the Greek family as that of a boy, since the son alone was thought of as perpetuating the family and for a daughter a dowry must be provided. Furthermore, girls could not protect the state in time of war and danger. It is doubtless true that in the vast majority of cases of exposure girls and not boys were the victims. I fail, however, to find any evidence of frequency of their exposure in Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries, or aught to substantiate the statement: "Élever une fille, c'était un luxe coûteux, un sacrifice sans compensation!"

⁹ E.g. Eur. *Ion*, 472-477; Isoc. *Evag.* 72; Arist. *Rhet.* 1360 b 19-21, where he asserts that an essential to happiness is to have good children and many children.

¹⁰ *Hellenistic Athens*, 81. Cf. Stob. *Flor.*, chapter entitled *ὅτι καλὸν τὸ ἔχειν παῖδας*.

(Glotz, *op. cit.*). Because the father of Atalanta refused to rear daughters we need not suppose that Athenian fathers were similarly and generally so disposed.¹¹

In Greek mythology and legend stories of exposure of infants are extremely common, *e.g.* Zeus himself, Asclepius, Amphion and Zethus, Ion, Perseus, and Oedipus. It ought not to be necessary to say, however, that these legendary tales, and many others, are no more to be regarded as proof of prevalent practices in fifth-century Athens than similar mythical tales of cannibalism. The pastoral romance of the exposed children Daphnis and Chloe by Longus, who lived perhaps seven centuries after the period under consideration, is repeatedly cited as if it were of importance for Athenian conditions. Furthermore, shall we accept as applicable to Athens a letter of Egypt of the year 1 B.C., wherein a husband writes to his wife: "When — good luck to you — you bear offspring, if it is a male, let it live; if it is a female, expose it";¹² or the protest of Musonius, a philosopher of the first century after Christ, who exclaims: "Dreadful it is that some who do not have poverty to plead but are well-to-do and even wealthy, hardheartedly refuse to rear their younger children, in order that those already born may be all the richer!" (Stob. iv, 665, 1 ff. Wachsmuth-Hense).

We are now ready to examine arguments of a weightier character — and first, two references in Aristophanes which seem conclusive evidence to Glotz, Zimmern, Walters, and others. In the *Frogs*, 1190, Aeschylus, who is engaged in the destruction of the Euripidean prologue, affirms that Oedipus was ever most wretched, for "no sooner was he born than they exposed him, although it was winter, in an earthen pot (*ἐξέθεσαν ἐν ὀστράκῳ*).” On the last phrase the scholiast says: "Since they exposed children in pots (*ἐν χύτραις*); wherefore they call the act *χυτρίζειν*." Is Aristophanes referring here,

¹¹ Arist. *Rhet.* 1361 a 5 f.: "The individual has happiness when his own children are numerous and good, both *female* and male."

¹² Cf. Zimmern, *op. cit.* 329.

as is generally assumed, to a widespread Athenian practice of his own day? I think not. We have merely a reference to the well-known tale of the fate of Oedipus of Thebes. The scholiast's verb *χυτρίζειν*, which is taken by some writers as the technical term for an everyday occurrence, is found only in the scholium on *ἐγχυτρίζειν* in the *Wasps*, 289. Here it has the meaning 'to make way with,' being equivalent to *χυτρίζειν*, which was used, the scholiast further says, by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Pherecrates. But these poets also are treating of mythological events (Nauck, p. 39). Hesychius in the brief definitions of the verbs *χυτρίζειν* and *ἐγχυτρίζειν* undoubtedly is referring to these Aristophanic scholia. In the *Thesmophoriazusae*, 505, the words *ἐν χύτρᾳ τὸ παιδίον* refer to a baby purchased by a wife for the purpose of deceiving her husband. *Ἐγχυτρισμός*, which Zimmern says is the word for 'pot-exposure,' does not seem to occur at all in classical Greek.

The second passage in Aristophanes is in the parabasis of the *Clouds*, 530-532, where the poet, humorously speaking of his play, the *Banqueters*, written when he was of tender years and because of his inexperience in producing plays entrusted to another as *διδάσκαλος*, says: "And I, for I was a maid, and not ripe for motherhood, exposed (*ἐξέθηκα*) my bairn, who was mothered by another's care, and gently nurtured and schooled by you" (Starkie's translation). The scholiast, thinking the word *ἐξέθηκα* needs interpretation, explains that the metaphor is derived from the practice of women who have clandestinely given birth to children and, fearing detection, have put the infants out of doors in the hope that some one will save them. The passage proves nothing then as to the actual practice of respectable married Athenian citizens of Aristophanes' time; in fact, as a further explanation of the meaning of the verb *ἐξέθηκα*, the scholiast refers to Euripides' *Phoenissae*, 25, where the verb is used again of that famous legendary victim of exposure, Oedipus of Thebes. I find in Greek literature only the following

instances of the use of ἐκτίθημι to refer to the exposure of children: Hdt. I, 112, the dramatic story of the infant Cyrus; Eur. *Ion*, another legendary tale; Eur. *Phoen.* 25, and Ar. *Clouds*, 531 (see above); Paus. I, 43, 7, of Apollo's child; Isoc. *Phil.* 95 c, of the infant Cyrus; Luc. *de Sacr.* 5, of Zeus exposed in Crete. All these are cases of exposure in *myths*; none are actual cases in Athens.

So much for Aristophanes. The next bit of evidence generally, though wrongly, cited as of great importance is the *Ion* of Euripides. In this play there is told at length a mythical tale of legendary Athens. Creusa, daughter of Erechtheus, betrayed by Apollo, *secretly* bears a son, Ion, and to avoid detection exposes the child with marks of identification in a cave. The babe is of course rescued, and by Hermes. The dénouement is strikingly dramatic and all ends happily. There is clearly no evidence here for the frequency of exposure in contemporary Athens. Illegitimate children are generally unwelcome and from time immemorial have often been concealed or put away at birth.

But what shall we say of the New Comedy? Is not a favorite character in this drama the infant exposed and recovered by its parents? As Glotz says: "La nouvelle comédie semble avoir été peuplée de petites filles abandonnées," and he claims, of course, that the New Comedy is merely a mirror of the actual life of the time. This is also the contention of Legrand, *op. cit.* 210, who can furnish no better evidence, however, than to cite Plato and Aristotle (to be discussed later), Aristophanes (see above), and Polybius (see below); he also discusses supposititious children and refers the reader to Glotz's article on *Expositio*. But does the New Comedy, in which the motif of the exposed babe is frequent, actually reflect real life so far as to make us believe that nearly every Athenian street corner daily had its abandoned infant? ¹³ In answer we might urge the fact that we are discussing Athens of the years 450-350 B.C. and not the

¹³ One might infer this from Zimmern.

period of the New Comedy, c. 336-250, when social, economic, and political conditions had very greatly changed, and that, too, for the worse. But waiving this very important fact, I do not think that the New Comedy can, or should be, taken literally, as it frequently is, to picture for us the conduct of the actual, average, normal Athenian citizen in any period. On the contrary the drama presents that which is unusual, and it is the business of comedy to caricature, to exaggerate, and to parody. For our edification and entertainment comedy chooses not the sober youth of exemplary character and impeccable behavior, but the spendthrift, the idler, the disobedient son, and the dissipated young man who is ever getting into scrapes. It shows us as a protagonist the rascally slave, and not the faithful and trustworthy servant. It loves to depict the fawning parasite, and not the modest and self-respecting man. In other words, its success, even its very existence, is dependent upon the portrayal of the eccentric, the exceptional, and the bizarre. Now it seems to me that in the frequent appearance of the motif of the exposed infant in the New Comedy, and thereafter in Plautus and Terence, we have repeated over and over again a stock dramatic device, a motif of striking human interest, which had always appealed strongly to the Greeks.¹⁴ We see the story in earliest mythology told of many of the gods; it is the keynote of the Oedipus myth and the tragedy of Sophocles; it served Euripides to rich purpose in the *Ion*; Herodotus employs the theme with telling effect in the story of Cyrus; at Rome it recurs in the tale of Romulus and Remus. Small wonder that it was appropriated and repeated by the New Comedy. Few dramatic situations have greater possibilities for arousing suspense and sustaining interest in the dénouement, than this of the abandoned child, its miraculous rescue, its identification by means of tokens, and its eventual fulfillment of an amazing

¹⁴ Cf. Capps, *Four Plays of Menander*, 52, note: "The extent of the practice is by no means to be inferred from the use made of the motive, with its romantic possibilities, by the dramatic poets."

destiny which results in woe indescribable, as in the *Oedipus*, or general joy, as in the New Comedy. I do not mean to imply that the Athenian audience would not know of actual cases of abandoned children in the society about them. But such cases were exceptional. The modern drama furnishes, it seems to me, many analogous examples. French plays have been largely based on the so-called "triangle" of husband, wife, and lover; it would be sheer ignorance, however, to assert that marital infidelity and domestic infelicity are the rule and not the exception in French society of today. The occurrence of suicide in an Ibsen play is not taken as proof of the astounding prevalence of suicide in Scandinavia.

Over-population, pressure of inhabitants, and the evil economic situation arising therefrom are sometimes offered as reasons for the barbarous custom of infanticide. And they are sound reasons, it is true. But what were conditions of life in Athens in the fifth and first half of the fourth centuries B.C.? Was there a great congestion of population in Attica? Was unemployment general? Was poverty rife? Was there social demoralization? The answer is 'no' to all these questions. On the contrary, Attica needed more workers; we hear of no unemployment; Pericles welcomed foreigners; the commercial activities and prosperity of citizens and metics were fostered by the help of the slaves who were not yet too numerous. Compared with other Greek communities Athens was rich. Furthermore, towards the end of the fifth century we see dread forces operating to reduce cruelly the number of inhabitants of Attica, namely, the heavy fatalities of the long-drawn-out Peloponnesian War, the frightful visitation of the plague when one person in four perished, the ill-fated Sicilian expedition which sent thousands of Athenians to die like rats in Sicilian quarries. All these factors were draining Attica, not to mention the constant very high death rate which generally obtained, particularly among children. In view of all these facts is it reasonable to ascribe the practice of wholesale infanticide to the Athenians of this period? To

do so would resemble the prescription of generous bloodletting for a victim of anaemia.

In Plato and Aristotle are to be found several references which apparently sanction in certain circumstances the exposure of infants in their imaginary communities. In the *Republic*, 461 C, Plato, enunciating the measures whereby the population of the ideal state is to be restricted, says (Jowett's translation): "Children of inferior parents, and of the better, when they chance to be deformed, will be put away in some mysterious, unknown place, as they should be" (*ἐν ἀπορρήτῳ τε καὶ ἀδήλῳ κατακρύψουσιν, ὡς πρέπει*). He further says with regard to possible offspring of parents of unsuitable age that "any embryo which may come into being should be prevented from seeing the light; and if any force a way to the birth, the parents must understand that the offspring of such a union cannot be maintained, and arrange accordingly." In these passages Plato's language is ambiguous, but Jowett and Campbell and Adam agree that his real meaning is infanticide. Nevertheless, in the *Timaeus*, 19 A, he recommends that the offspring of inferior guardians be distributed among the lower classes, with no reference to the putting away of undesired infants, and some scholars think that he had changed his view when the *Timaeus* was written.

Aristotle (*Pol.* 1335 b 19), for his ideal state of sharply restricted population, advocates a law that no deformed child shall be reared; if there arises danger of excess population "abortion shall be procured before sensation and life have begun (*πρὶν αἰσθησιν ἐγγενέσθαι καὶ ζώην*), for that which is holy in this matter will be marked off from that which is not by the absence or presence of sensation and life."¹⁵

What may be deduced from these opinions of the philosophers? That they reflect actual Athenian conditions which

¹⁵ See Newman, *Politics of Aristotle*, III, 474 and I, 187, where he says: "Aristotle appears to be more opposed to exposure and to abortion in advanced stages of pregnancy than Plato."

were general? Of course not. They refer to heroic measures for limitation of population, which *might* be resorted to in their imaginary polities. In fact, throughout the *Republic* and the *Politics* we find Plato and Aristotle advocating stringent legislation and social and economic procedure which were poles apart from all that we know of actual Athenian ethics and laws. In recommending exposure of deformed infants they are borrowing with approval a provision of the well-known Spartan code, which is not surprising since we know how thoroughly both philosophers sympathized with Spartan institutions. This, however, may be said, that in recommending exposure in extreme cases they were not running counter to general Greek opinion and feeling and to occasional contemporary practice. But Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* is a better index of Athenian belief than Aristotle in the *Politics*. In the former (1360 b 20 f.), in his analysis of happiness, he says that a contributing element is the possession of good children and many children. The individual has blessings when his own children are numerous and good, both female and male.

Although the evidence in general fails to prove the prevalence of the exposure of infants at Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries, there is indisputable proof of the growth of the custom in later times throughout the Greek world. The direct testimony of Polybius gives a graphic picture of the social demoralization rife in his day, about the year 150 B.C., and the resultant decrease in population in which infanticide played a melancholy and tragic rôle. He says (xxxvii, 9): "In our time all Greece was visited by a dearth of children and generally a decay of population, owing to which the cities were denuded of inhabitants and a failure of productiveness resulted, though there were no long-continued wars or serious pestilences among us. . . . This evil grew upon us rapidly, and without attracting attention, by our men becoming perverted to a passion for show and money and the pleasures of an idle life, and accordingly either not marrying at all, or, if

they did marry, refusing to rear the children that were born, or at most one or two out of a great number, for the sake of leaving them well off or bringing them up in extravagant luxury. For when there are only one or two sons, it is evident that, if war or pestilence carries off one, the houses must be left heirless, and, like swarms of bees, little by little the cities become sparsely inhabited and weak. On this subject there is no need to ask the gods how we are to be relieved from such a curse, for any one in the world will tell you that it is by the men themselves if possible changing their objects of ambition, or, if that cannot be done, by passing laws for the preservation of infants" (Shuckburgh's translation). This vigorous indictment by Polybius of a decadent society for a repugnant practice contributing to social and economic demoralization was supplemented by the repeated censures of Christian and Jewish teachers and philosophers who condemned the practice, which was to them immoral and irreligious as well as inhumane and vicious.

The following conclusions may be drawn as a result of this study. Abandonment of infants occurred to a greater or lesser degree throughout the Greek world from earliest times, and in the late Hellenistic Period became, it appears, an actual menace and evil. It was legally sanctioned at Sparta in the case of deformed children. It was nowhere forbidden by law except possibly at Thebes at a late date (Ael. *V.H.* II, 7). It was nowhere severely condemned by general public opinion and feeling, since the Greeks did not have the moral and religious scruples relative to the matter which influenced Christians and Jews. Yet the Athenians were certainly not altogether lacking in humanity, as is shown, for example, by their care of orphans at the public expense and the pensions allotted to those physically incapable of earning a livelihood. It is true that the father's will in the family was regarded as supreme, but there are many indications that the wishes of the wife and mother were by no means ignored by the husband and father. Is it natural to suppose that the vote of the

Athenian mother would be frequently cast for the repudiation of her own child, or that her influence, in the matter of the fate of legitimate offspring, would be without weight? In Athens, however — a great community with large foreign and slave elements in the population — cases of exposure of course occurred. Infants in this world have ever been abandoned by unmarried mothers, by prostitutes, by victims of poverty, vice, dissipation, brutality, war, and slavery. For these unfortunates the ancient world made no adequate provision, whereas the modern world provides foundlings' homes, orphan asylums, and the institutions of the Church. But in Athens so-called exposure of infants by no means meant infanticide. In fact, thoroughgoing measures might be employed to ensure the safety of the child. In the New Comedy and in the *Ion* of Euripides the infant is carefully dressed, placed in a basket or earthen vessel, and left in a prominent location, such as the entrance to a temple or sacred cave, where it is promptly seen and rescued. In actual cases the fate of the child must have been doubtful and depended on the person into whose hands it fell. If it survived it might be adopted by childless parents or, at worst, reared for slavery or the brothel. At any rate we do not hear of actual death as being the usual fate.

The chief contention of this article is that there is no sound evidence which proves the prevalence of the exposure of newborn infants in Athens of the Classical Period, or shows that the practice particularly flourished there among respectable married citizens as a repellent evil of great proportions. The proof generally offered, and stated above, does not stand sober scrutiny, namely, the so-called evidence supposedly furnished by legend, myth, Aristophanic and Euripidean references to myth, dramatic motifs of the third-century New Comedy, hypothetical regulations of Platonic and Aristotelian imaginary polities of Spartan coloring, Polybius of 150 B.C., and Longus, the pastoral romancer of the second century after Christ.

XI. — *The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of His Metrical Art*¹

BY PROFESSOR ROBERT S. RADFORD

UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

I. Introduction. Ovid and the Messalla Collection

IN his chapter on famous orators, Quintilian aptly observes that, for later generations, Cicero had become not so much the name of a person as the designation of the art of oratory. We may apply a similar remark to the Latin poet Ovid. To students of Roman literature Ovid means the perfected elegiac art, the supreme mastery of the technical side of Latin verse, to which he contributed an unparalleled elegance and grace. Yet it is certain that he was also a person, and we know more of the actual details of his life than of the life of any other Roman, with the single exception of Cicero. Every schoolboy is familiar with the charming picture which he has given in the *Tristia* of his early devotion to the Muses, in spite of the remonstrances of his father and the arguments which the latter urged against unprofitable literary pursuits.

¹ Bibliography: — Hultgren, *Observationes metr. in poetas elegiacos Gr. et Lat.*, Leipzig, 1871; Köne, *Sprache der röm. Epiker*, Münster, 1840; Radford, "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven, 1920), 251-272; O. F. Gruppe, *Röm. Elegie*, Leipzig, 1838; Klee-
mann, *De libri tertii carminibus quae Tibulli nom. circumferuntur*, Strassburg, 1876; Teuffel, *Studien u. Charakteristiken*, Leipzig, 1871; Fuss, *De elegiarum libro quem Lygdami esse putant quidam*, Münster, 1867; Krafft, *De artibus quas Tib. et Lygd. in versibus concinnandis adhibuerunt*, Halle, 1874; Paroli, *De Tib. arte metr. cum Lygd. comparata*, Brescia, 1899; Hartung, *De panegyrico ad Messallam pseudo-Tib.*, Halle, 1880; Ehrenguber, *De panegy. Messallae pseudo-Tib., partes I-X*, Kremsmünster, 1889-1899; Knappe, *De Tib. libri quarti elegiis*, Duderstadt, 1880; Némethy, *Albii Tibulli carmina*, etc., Budapest, 1905; *Lygdami carmina*, Budapest, 1906; K. F. Smith, *Elegies of Tibullus*, New York, 1913; Burman, *Ovidii opera omnia*, Amsterdam, 1756, with Index Verborum; Eschenburg, *Wie hat Ovid einzelne Wörter u. Wortklassen im Verse verwandt?*, Lübeck, 1886; H. de la Ville de Mirmont, "Le poète Lygdamus," *Musée Belge*, VIII (1904), 339-403; Plessis, *La poésie latine* (Paris, 1909), 361-376; Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* II³, I, 232 ff.; Ullrich, *Studia Tib.: De libri II editione*, Berlin, 1880.

He was one of the most precocious of Roman poets, and like Cowley or like Pope he "lisped in numbers, for the numbers came."² According to his own account, when he first recited his juvenile poems to a public audience, his "beard had been shaved only once or twice."³ This plain statement is usually misinterpreted, but clearly the natural meaning is that when he first entered the circle of his patron, Messalla, he was only fifteen or sixteen years of age.⁴ Beginning to write at so early a period, when the simpler and more natural school of Catullus, Gallus, and Propertius was still in the ascendant, Ovid passed through a long period of apprenticeship and, after much wavering and much experimentation, eventually abandoned the more natural manner with which he had begun, and went over wholly to the more artistic and more epigrammatic style of Tibullus, which he found better suited to his own rhetorical training and to which he finally gave an undisputed supremacy in the domain of Roman elegy. It is true that a different opinion is usually held today, and it is everywhere assumed that he devoted himself from the first to the imitation of Tibullus and possessed from the beginning the remarkable facility and skill which make him easily the first of Roman metrical artists. This view seems to me wholly erroneous, and I shall begin in the present study to trace the various stages by which Ovid, the historical person, the friend of Messalla, the disciple first of Catullus and later of Tibullus, reached the acme of artistic perfection.

As is well known, the poet Ovid possessed brilliant powers of description, and was both a natural story-teller and a

² Sponte sua carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos,

Et quod temptabam scribere (in prose), versus erat. — *Trist.* iv, 10, 25.

³ *Ib.* 57.

⁴ There was no definite time fixed for the *depositio barbae*, but it usually coincided with the assumption of the *toga virilis* (Suet. *Calig.* 10). Most writers incorrectly make this statement refer to Ovid's twentieth or twenty-second year, as Schanz, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* 11³, 1, § 293; J. Heuwes, *De tempore quo Ov. Amores conscripti sint* (Münster, 1883), 14; Cruttwell, *Rom. Lit.* 306, etc.

highly trained rhetorician. He is noted for his "swift lightness of touch," his brief, snappy sentences, his sharp contrasts, and his terse and highly polished epigrams (cf. K. F. Smith, *op. cit.* Introd. 103 ff.). Since we seek, however, to trace an actual historical development, it may be worth while to return for a moment to 'Ovid' in the meaning of the perfected art of elegy, and to picture clearly the numerous refinements which his finished technique embraces. These rules include the breaking up of the long sentence and the restriction of the thought to a single distich, the avoidance of elision, especially in the latter half of both the hexameter and the pentameter, the marked preference given in the hexameter to the favorite masculine caesura (the *semi-quinaria*), the ending of the pentameter with a dissyllable, which should not be an adjective, but either a noun or a verb, and above all the preponderance of dactyls in the distich in direct opposition to the original and native character of the language. Through the observance of these complex requirements the elegiac couplet gains an incomparable elegance and precision, at the same moment that it loses its larger variety, freedom, and ease. Tibullus himself had narrowed the sphere of Roman elegy by rejecting the natural period and restricting the thought within the minimum space of two lines. This limitation, which is unknown to Catullus and Propertius, is undoubtedly a serious mistake, and it finds little justification of any kind in the previous history of the elegy. Yet, although he gave an artificial form to the distich, Tibullus, through the expression of simple and natural emotion, invariably retained its proper content, and he could not foresee perhaps that the more brilliant but more wayward Ovid would too often, through the absence of sincere and genuine feeling, merge the elegy in the epigram and make both form and content unduly artificial. Both Tibullus and Ovid then were consummate artists, but both yielded too much to the prevailing tendency of the Augustan age in restricting the liberty and the spontaneity of their

verse. Tibullus is excessively rhetorical in form, Ovid is excessively rhetorical in both form and thought. (See also some just observations in Sellar, *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, 307.)

Even more characteristic of our poet, however, than the unity of the distich and the *tyrannis* of the dissyllabic close is the dactylic preponderance. We may say that Ovid is the poet, *par excellence*, of the dactylic virtuosity, which appears alike in his epic and his elegiac verse. While the Greek language is twice as rich in dactyls as in spondees,⁵ in Latin this relation is reversed, and the Roman language has almost twice as many spondees as dactyls. In all the other poets of Rome (with the exception only of Valerius Flaccus and a few genuine elegies of Tibullus' second book) the spondees considerably exceed the dactyls; Ovid alone has known — like the Medea or the Circe of his own exuberant fancy — how to transform, by the magic of his art, the slow but stately spondees of his native speech into the light and graceful dactyls of Hellenic verse. Through this supreme refinement he has brought to fulfillment the mission which Ennius, the hardy pioneer, had vaguely dreamed of nearly two centuries before, and has banished from Latium the last trace of Italian rusticity (cf. Hor. *Epist.* II, 1, 160). He is the greatest artist in verse that Rome produced, the supreme master both in the elegy and in the epos. It is no wonder then that Lucian Müller exclaims in ecstatic admiration (*De re metrica*², 522): “Hunc igitur virum, qui principatum haud dubie tenet artis Latinae, veneremur, hunc imitemur. hic sciat se plurimum profecisse, cui plurimum probetur Ovidius. huius quot sunt versus, totidem sunt artificia, quovis Phidiae illa vel Praxitelis opere non minora.”⁶ Our chief metrical scholars have carried their worship and adoration so far that they have ended by creating a veritable ‘Ovid myth.’ Ovid is Rome's one white

⁵ Hultgren, *op. cit.* 8; Köne, *op. cit.* 5 ff.

⁶ See also *ib.* 79; Gleditsch, *Metrik*, § 152, 7; Hultgren, *op. cit.* 35, and *Jahrbücher f. class. Phil.* XIX (1873), 750.

crow and he was always white. His art is free from the trammels of place and time, and knows no process of growth, no stage of development, but the Fates conferred upon the divine man⁷ at his birth a faculty that was miraculously complete. Hence Lucian Müller, *op. cit.* 346, pronounces a passage in the *Amores*, which contains several elisions, interpolated, and declares those Epistles of the Heroines, which show one or two polysyllabic closes, to be spurious (*ib.* 29 ff., 259). Hultgren, *op. cit.* 26 ff., insists that the comparative lack of virtuosity in the *de Medicamine* fragment is not the result of immature art, but of pure accident, and asserts that to attribute to Ovid any work actually lacking the virtuosity would be to "place the head of Thersites upon the body of Agamemnon" (*ib.* 32). Ehrenguber, who has computed or collected the percentages of so many Latin poets, announces the rule that each author has his definite dactylic proportion from which he never greatly departs (*op. cit.* x, 12 ff.). Even such a master of statistics as Drobisch, when he acutely observes that "the *Amores* of Ovid, especially in the hexameter, fall short by a little more than 2% of the virtuosity attained in the *Ars*" (*Ber. sächs. Gesellschaft.* XXIII [1871], 33), does not seem to have grasped the full truth; for he apparently thought of the decline in the virtuosity as evenly distributed over the entire *Amores*. In point of fact, nothing could be more erroneous than these views. Thus Quintilian, ix, 3, 70, had before him a collection of Ovidian epigrams quite similar to the *Priapea* and containing rather frequent polysyllabic closes; he actually quotes the line, Cur ego non dicam, Fūria, te fūriam?

In order to determine the whole question definitely, I have carefully examined the three books of the *Amores* which we now possess and which were not published before 2 B.C., when the poet was forty-one. It is well known that there was an earlier edition in five books, published in 14 B.C., when the poet was already twenty-nine. According to my

⁷ Cf. Cic. *Arch.* 7, 16: hunc divinum hominem, Africanum.

results, nearly one-fourth of the poems in our present *Amores* have been retained from the first edition with little change, and still show the original spondaic form which they possessed at their first publication. The mature works of Ovid, such as the *Ars*, show 57% of dactyls in the distich, while the first edition of the *Amores*, according to my reconstruction, did not greatly exceed 48.5%. The remaining three-fourths of our present edition consists of poems which have either been fully revised or newly written, and if the spondaic fourth be subtracted, their percentage rises to more than 56%. In other words, the remaining poems show practically the same virtuosity as the mature works. In the second section of this paper I shall exhibit these results more fully and in tabular form. It is evident therefore that Ovid first composed in spondees, which is precisely what we should expect on a priori grounds. For, Latin being a highly spondaic language, it seems just about as possible for a youthful poet to lisp in Chinese or in Choctaw as in Latin dactyls. We may go further, however, and assert that even if Ovid, on his first appearance in 27 B.C., had possessed all the miraculous gifts with which he has been credited, he would not have actually composed in dactyls. It is true that even at this early date Tibullus was highly esteemed,⁸ yet the memory of the free republic was still cherished, and the more natural school of Catullus was still preferred. Hence, in all probability, even if the youthful Ovid had possessed the dactylic faculty, he would have lacked the will to virtuosity, since the latter implies also a willingness to sacrifice the larger perspicuity of expression and the normal descriptive word orders. Furthermore, two of the three highly dactylic elegies of Tibullus' second book were not composed until 22 B.C., five years later, as is shown by their imitation of Propertius (Némethy, *op. cit.* 338).

The importance of the reconstruction of the first edition

⁸ . . . Legiturque Tibullus

Et placet, et iam te (sc. Augusto) *principe* notus erat. — *Trist.* II, 464.

of the *Amores* and of the consequent recovery of the youthful or 'spondaic' Ovid cannot easily be overestimated. Freed from fanciful and unwarranted presuppositions, we are at liberty to restore the actual, historical Ovid, and we shall be able to show in the sequel, as I believe, that this great artistic genius, beginning, just like Catullus, with simple nature and therefore in some cases with only 37% of dactyls in the distich, has made in less than twenty years an unparalleled development in his art, and, by veritably creating a new language, such as Ennius and his eager successors achieved only in part, has been able, in the works of his full maturity, composed after the age of thirty-five, to rise to 57% of dactyls in the distich. I do not seek, however, to reconstruct the spondaic period of Ovid's art for a purely theoretical purpose nor with the aim of contrasting in an abstract manner the first *Amores* with all the remaining works; I wish rather to restore the poet's early life, and partly by following in the footsteps of eminent critics, such as Gruppe, Plessis, Klee-
mann, Ehrenguber, Ribbeck, Marx, Schanz, and Cartault, partly by completing and enlarging their work, I hope to endow him with an appropriate set of spondaic works. These juvenile works are, from the Appendix Vergiliana, at least *Catalepton*, ix, and from the Corpus Tibullianum the whole of the Messalla Collection as well as two of the six elegies contained in Tibullus' second or posthumous book. The proper discussion of these poems naturally requires a series of articles. In the present study I shall deal only with the metrical development, while in several articles to be published shortly in the *American Journal of Philology*, I shall examine in detail, with the help of Burman's much neglected Index, the language of the juvenile poems in relation to Ovid's mature works and also sketch more fully the history of the controversy which has raged for more than a century among critics over the authorship and value of the Messalla Collection.⁹

⁹ So far as concerns the Lygdamus elegies, a most just and admirable account of the controversy is given by H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *op. cit.* 339-

A briefer outline, however, of the various opinions of scholars cannot be wholly omitted here, especially as the controversy over the Lygdamus poems constitutes one of the most amazing chapters in the whole history of literary criticism. I may begin with the so-called Messalla Collection. This latter is a collection of famous poems emanating from the household of the great Augustan statesman, Valerius Messalla. In our fourteenth-century codices it forms a single book, added to the unfinished second book of Tibullus and apparently published, like the posthumous second book, in 19 B.C. The Italian scholars of the fifteenth century have wrongly divided this additional book into two, the so-called third and fourth books of Tibullus, and for the purpose of avoiding confusion it seems best to retain this division. (Probably, as all the mediaeval citations show, there were originally only 'two books of Tibullus,' and the second book of 1111 verses was first divided at the close of the Middle Ages into the second and third books which our late codices exhibit; see Ullrich, *op. cit.* 69.) In the six elegies of the third book a youth apparently of eighteen or nineteen, yet already famous as a poet and employing the pseudonym of Lygdamus, seeks to win back the love of the fair Neaera, who has divorced him. It is probable, too, that he has given cause for the divorce, though naturally this is not admitted and he pleads a difficult case with wonderful facility. Although the poems of unhappy love easily admit of being turned to ridicule by an unfair critic like Voss, I know of no juster criticism upon them than that of Teuffel, written in mature life and before he (like Dissen) had lent an ear to the slanders of Voss: "These elegies, through the freshness and sincerity of the feeling and the graceful ease of the verse, do their author no discredit."¹⁰ As is well known, Lygdamus

403. Although the author does not fully understand the real issues, I wish to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to the historical part of this fine study.

¹⁰ Quoted by Kleemann, *op. cit.* 17, from Pauly's *Realencyclopaedie*, VI, 2, 1950 (1852).

tells us the exact date of his birth (5, 18). "My parents first beheld my birthday," he says, "in the year in which both the consuls met an equal fate" (*cum cecidit fato consul uterque pari*) — he means in 43 B.C., when Hirtius and Pansa were both slain in battle before Mutina. Now precisely the same pentameter (*cum cecidit*, etc.) is used by Ovid, *Trist.* IV, 10, 6, to give his own birth-date of 43 B.C. The Renaissance editors, Scaliger and Vulpius, perhaps attached less importance to the dozen or more whole lines and half-lines which Ovid and Lygdamus have in common, and the numerous other amazing coincidences, but they knew well that, in the case of different poets, the date of birth and the birth-line cannot be borrowed. Wishing therefore to preserve the third book for Tibullus and to prevent it from being assigned to Ovid, they pronounced the birth-line an interpolation from the *Tristia* and bracketed the whole distich. The same procedure was followed later by Broukhuysen (1708), Wunderlich (1817), Bährens (1876), and Ramsay (1887).

Matters remained in this state until the German peasant poet of Mecklenburg and the great classical translator, Johann Heinrich Voss, appeared upon the scene (1810). Voss's works abound in homely and realistic scenes of village and country life, and his idyl, *Luise*, published in 1795, furnished Goethe with a model for *Hermann und Dorothea*. He was naturally much attracted by the simple pastoral elegy of Tibullus, and when he came, in the third book, to the poems of Lygdamus with their brilliant pictures of elegance and wealth, he saw at once that this courtly city poet could not possibly be Tibullus. He therefore removed the name of Tibullus from the third book and substituted that of Lygdamus. So far he showed himself an excellent critic, but he did not stop here. He poured forth against the romanticist masquerading under the name of the unworldly Tibullus a torrent of vituperation and of coarse abuse that is well-nigh incredible, and that many of our editors of Tibullus and many of our orthodox historians of Roman literature have ever since repeated in the

most credulous or most servile fashion, but naturally in language somewhat more decorous and more restrained.¹¹ Although Voss never possessed any great vogue in Germany at large as a critic, his authority among classical philologists was immense, and it is chiefly to his violent attack upon the Lygdamus elegies that we must ascribe the hopeless confusion that has since arisen among scholars and that has made the question of the authorship of these poems an insoluble 'mystery.' A part of the responsibility for the entanglement belongs, however, to W. Hertzberg, the well-known editor of Propertius. He also was possessed of great authority in his day, although his conclusions were usually hasty and Plessis, *Études sur Properce*, 80, charges him with an "incurable recklessness" (*une incurable légèreté*). Otto Friedrich Gruppe, a critic of the first order, had just published his standard work, *Die römische Elegie* (1838). In a brilliant and forceful chapter of this book (pp. 105-143) he confidently identifies Lygdamus with Ovid and Neaera with Ovid's second wife, the "blameless spouse" of the *Tristia*, IV, 10, 71, who did not, however, long remain married to the poet. Hertzberg at once came forward to answer Gruppe and, as Teuffel believed (*op. cit.* 380), to make the identification with Ovid forever impossible. He apparently believed that the *Heroides*, which stood first in the older editions, were the earliest works of Ovid. Naturally he experienced little difficulty in showing that these poems consist almost entirely of dactyls,¹² and

¹¹ Of course every classical scholar must entertain the kindest feeling and the greatest respect for the famous translator of the *Odyssey* and of the *Georgics*, but no account of the Lygdamus controversy can be intelligible which fails to bring out strongly Voss's violent prejudices and his scurrilous language. Fuss, *op. cit.* 54, cites numerous examples of the latter, and protests earnestly against such unfair methods of controversy. It appears to the present writer, however, that greater blame attaches to Voss's obsequious followers than to Voss himself. For Voss was a privileged character as a man of genius who had a distinct point of view — the simple life and the return to nature. Many of the scholars, however, who have been content to take their criticism at second hand from Voss, have no special point of view and no excuse that seems valid.

¹² "In his versification Ovid skips and dances, so that his hexameter, even

show an excessive accumulation of rhetorical effects. Therefore, he concludes, the Lygdamus elegies, which are written in spondees and in a natural style, cannot possibly be the work of Ovid. With the recklessness which Plessis has justly noted, he adds: "These characteristics of the metre are precisely those which stand out most sharply in youth." The truth is just the reverse, and Hultgren correctly lays down the rule that the more the poet advances towards the prime of life, the more the proportion of dactyls and of dactylic beginnings increases.¹³

The majority of careful students, be it said to their credit, have never accepted the prejudiced views of Voss: thus the elegies have been vigorously defended by Spohn (1819), by Golbéry, the Lemaire editor (1826), by Fuss (1867), and by Cranstoun, the English translator (1872). Much more moderate views are also to be found in Cruttwell (1877), Ribbeck (1889), and Sellar (1892). Finally, Plessis, in his *Poésie Latine* (1909), in the chapter devoted to Lygdamus (pp. 361-376), has at once paid a beautiful tribute to the genuine merits of these elegies and given a noble exemplification of the true critic's art. In his view, they proceed from a youthful poet of rare and brilliant genius, whose native generosity and tenderness of feeling have not yet been spoiled by contact with the corruptions of the world.

Gruppe had made it probable that the Lygdamus elegies are the work of Ovid, but he had not proved it. This proof was, however, definitely rendered by S. Kleemann (1876), who, in an elaborate dissertation, with the help of Burman's in the more serious poems (*Tristia* and *Fasti*), has nothing but dactyls in almost a half of the verses" (*Hallische Jahrbücher* 1 [1839], 1024 ff., quoted by Teuffel, *op. cit.* 380 ff., and by Kleemann, *op. cit.* 42 ff.).

¹³ *Op. cit.* 29: "Hexametri Ovidiani illustria exempla sunt, quae docent eo magis crescere numerum dactylorum, quo magis ipse in arte procedat. . . . Dubitari amplius nequit, quin poetarum elegiacorum poemata, minus dactylice in principio distichi constructa, inter opera iuvenilis aetatis referenda, carmina autem cum plurimis initiis dactylicis florenti aetati adnumeranda sint." Kleemann, *op. cit.* 29, justly lays down the same canon for Tibullus: "arte erudita in hexametris dactylus crebrior fit."

Index, examined the language minutely and pronounced it wholly Ovidian. It should be added that Kleemann used only a part of the available material from the Index and the Ovidian corpus — perhaps not more than one-half — but even this, in my judgment, is far more than is strictly necessary for purposes of valid proof. Kleemann's study was much praised by the reviewers, but otherwise it has received little attention.¹⁴ The reasons for this neglect are not far to seek. Many scholars had accepted without question and without independent study the distorted views of Voss which came to them in a slightly diluted form through the voluminous commentary of Dissen; others lay entrenched in fancied security behind the barrier of the metre which Hertzberg had so conveniently and so confidently provided. Strangely enough, the Index to Ovid remained practically a closed book.

As soon as the Burman Index is used, the whole Messalla Appendix is seen to be unmistakably the work of the youthful Ovid, *aetate* eighteen to twenty-four.¹⁵ There is complete identity of vocabulary, and all the most characteristic Ovidianisms are in the Appendix, except only those which were developed later for the sake of the virtuosity and which are conveniently enumerated by Eschenburg. The evidence which is drawn merely from repeated tags and half-verses, without distinctive peculiarity of usage, is of course inconclusive for an author like Ovid who borrows so freely from contemporary poets, but the proof that rests upon the plainest and simplest idioms often recurring is one that scarcely admits of doubt or question. The Lygdamus poems, com-

¹⁴ An honorable exception is Professor K. P. Harrington's scholarly edition of the Roman elegiac poets (Selections, 1914). Professor Harrington comments on the possible identity of Ovid and Lygdamus with complete candor and with an open mind, although he does not commit himself definitely (Introd. 36).

¹⁵ In justice to myself, it is only fair to state that I reached my conclusions as to the identity of Lygdamus and Ovid at a time when I was acquainted neither with Gruppe's results nor with those of Kleemann and Ehrenguber, but was obliged to rely upon the simple text of Ovid and Eichert's lexicon to the *Metamorphoses* (Hanover, 1886).

posed at eighteen or nineteen, contain about ninety specific and striking Ovidianisms; Kleemann gives about half of these. The Panegyric upon Messalla contains probably more than a hundred Ovidianisms; Ehrengruber has already called attention to all of these, and in order to explain their occurrence, has propounded the ingenious theory that the Panegyric was a school exercise composed in a later age by some pupil of the rhetoricians who had access to all the works of Ovid and pilfered most freely from them all.¹⁶ Next, as the metre shows, come the six little letters of Sulpicia, the kinswoman of Messalla, in which this lady (with Ovid's sympathetic assistance) undertakes the part of wooing the shy youth, Cerinthus; they contain more than twelve Ovidianisms. About 21 B.C., *aetate* twenty-two, Ovid composed the five charming elegies giving in fuller form the story of the same pair of happy lovers, Sulpicia and Cerinthus; they show more than forty Ovidianisms and 47.4% of dactyls, thus approaching closely to the proportion of the first *Amores* (about 48.5%). The exquisite imitation of Tibullus, *Nulla tuum nobis* (IV, 13), that closes the collection, has ten Ovidianisms. Since Ovid edits the unfinished second book, the two spondaic elegies, with Ovidian language and thought, are in all probability his work, and can no longer be ascribed to Tibullus either in whole or in part. The poem in honor of Messalinus (II, 5) has, in fact, long occasioned difficulty, and has been known for nearly a century as the 'suspected elegy.' The other Ovidian elegy, II, 2, is evidently a continuation of the Sulpicia group, and celebrates the birthday of the shy but sorely smitten lover Cerinthus, who is now happily married to Sulpicia and is therefore given his true name of Cornutus. This poem is rightly assigned to the 'fourth book' by Gruppe.

The conclusions which we have reached upon grounds of language and metre are supported also by strong external

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* x, 71; II, 28; III, 80, etc. This treatise of more than 700 pages in all is a magnificent collection of material and, in spite of its technically erroneous conclusion, is truly a masterly piece of work.

evidence. Thus in the letters of the exile Ovid refers in unmistakable terms to the issuance of the Appendix, when he writes that it was Messalla who first induced him to venture upon the publication of his works.¹⁷ He mentions expressly the epicedion which he had composed upon the death of his patron and which was sung in the forum (*Pont.* I, 7, 29 ff.), but he also refers again and again to poems which he had composed in Messalla's honor in his early youth. Thus he writes that not even the eldest son, Messalinus, can remember the time when he "first began to venerate Messalla" (*Pont.* II, 3, 79 ff.). This last statement scarcely applies, I think, to our *Panegyric*, but can be more fitly referred to an earlier eulogy which we fortunately still possess — I mean *Catalepton* IX (XI), contained in the Appendix Vergiliana, a poem which celebrates Messalla's triumph over Aquitania, and which was therefore written in the year 27 B.C. Ribbeck, *Appendix Vergil.* Proleg. 12, and *Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* II, 200, has already, on stylistic and metrical grounds, identified the author of this elegy with 'Lygdamus,' and both Marx (Pauly-Wissowa, I, 1326, s. v. *Albius*) and Schanz, *op. cit.* § 282, p. 233, speak approvingly of this view. I find on examination that these judgments are strongly supported by the language of the poem, and this elegy may therefore be confidently regarded as the earliest extant work of Ovid, written in his seventeenth year; in fact, in a brief monograph and admirable commentary which was published some years ago, but has just come into my hands at the moment of writing (*De Ovidio elegiae in Messallam auctore*, Budapest, 1909), Némethy, I find, has already clearly perceived and, in large measure, convincingly demonstrated the Ovidian authorship of the *Catalepton*. Messalinus, the eldest son, quindecimvir 19 B.C., consul 3 B.C., was probably born about 38–36 B.C., and can therefore scarcely have been more than ten years of age when this eulogy was composed.

I have not yet spoken of the date of the second eulogy

¹⁷ *Pont.* II, 3, 75 ff. (addressed to Cotta, the younger son).

which we possess, namely, the elaborate *Panegyric* of the Messalla Collection. This brilliant and highly rhetorical work is metrically more advanced than the Lygdamus elegies and was certainly composed at a later date than these poems. Undoubtedly, by an ingenious literary or artistic fiction, the *Panegyric* itself purports to be written in the year of Messalla's consulship, 31 B.C., and the events of the years 30-27 B.C., namely, the expeditions to Aquitania and the Orient, which had already been expressly celebrated by Tibullus (I, 7) and by the youthful Ovid (*Catalepton*, IX), are nowhere mentioned as having actually occurred. Special students of the *Panegyric*, however, have long seen that the Gallic and Egyptian campaigns are well known to the clever writer, and are most skilfully introduced into the poem by way of prophecy (*vaticinium ex eventu*).¹⁸ The *Panegyric* was therefore composed after the Lygdamus elegies, and the first draft of the poem must have been drawn up about the year 23 B.C.; it treats chiefly the earlier career of Messalla, which had not previously been made the subject of poetic encomium. We are not at present fully in a position to state how Ovid was occupied in the interval between the composition of the Lygdamus poems and the *Panegyric*. It is true that H. de la Ville de Mirmont confidently assumes (*Jeunesse d'Ovide*, 209) that it was shortly after the two early marriages and about his twentieth year that our poet visited Asia Minor and Sicily in the suite of the poet Macer, and at first glance the *Panegyric* also, in its present revised and perfected form, appears to contain probable or possible references to Sicily (vss. 197, 200). We must carefully refrain, however, from drawing hasty conclusions at present and must frankly admit that we cannot at once determine the exact date of the year which Ovid spent with Macer in Asia and Sicily (*Pont.* II, 10, 21 ff.).

A brief word must be said, however, upon Ovid's relation to the *Ciris* (the legend of Scylla and Nisus) in the Appendix

¹⁸ See Hartung, *op. cit.* 38 ff.; Ehrengruber, *op. cit.* I, 7; X, 71; also Belling, *Albius Tibullus: Untersuchung*, 205 ff.

Vergiliana. As is well known, this poem offers special peculiarities and difficulties. Besides being partly a translation from Greek sources, it everywhere closely follows the manner of Catullus and, owing to the poet's prodigious memory, in many passages it presents almost the appearance of a cento compiled from Catullus and Vergil. It was composed after the publication of the complete *Aeneid* (19 B.C.), the whole of which it imitates. The agreement therefore of the *Ciris* with the usual Ovidian vocabulary is not quite so close as we find in the other juvenile works, yet it is sufficient, I believe, easily and conclusively to establish Ovidian authorship, especially when we consider that, by a species of *κένωσις* and in a purely temporary stage of his art, the poet has divested himself of a part at least of his usual and natural manner. Certain it is that the situation described in the poem suits Ovid and Ovid alone. The work is addressed (vss. 36 and 54) to the young "Messalla," by whom Messalinus is evidently meant. The writer definitely renounces (vss. 1-2) the public career to which he had formerly devoted himself and of which he has now grown weary, but there is not a word in the poem to warrant the usual assumption that the author was a man of advanced years who had reached the age of forty-five or fifty.¹⁹ On the contrary, the situation is precisely that described in *Trist.* IV, 10, 33-40, *i.e.*, the author has held certain minor offices in the *cursus honorum* and now refuses to go further in the pursuit of public honors. Hence no one who has followed the career of Ovid with genuine interest can read the opening lines of the *Ciris* without some thrill of emotion.²⁰ Refusing to become a candidate for the quaestorship and the senatorial rank at the age of twenty-

¹⁹ Teuffel-Schwabe, *Hist. of Rom. Lit.*, Eng. trans. § 230, 2, 1; Ribbeck, *Gesch. d. röm. Dicht.* II, 355; Schanz, *op. cit.* § 241.

²⁰ Propertius also (III, 21, 25 ff.) finely pictures himself as a student at Athens in the school of Plato or the garden of Epicurus, but the scene is probably an imaginary one. At a more youthful age and with less experience of the world, Horace too visited Athens and "sought for truth amid the groves of the Academy" (*Epist.* II, 2, 45).

six, the poet whose influence upon subsequent European literature was to be so vast, hastens to Athens,²¹ the "fair garden of Cecrops,"²² and the true home of the intellectual life, in order to drink, at the fountain source, of the ever-living waters, and to worship at the shrine of the world's four great Teachers.²³ With the over-sanguine temperament of youth, he even dreams of composing at some future time a great epic upon nature and the creation that shall rival the sublime and majestic work of Lucretius.²⁴ The *Ciris* is to be placed then about the middle of Ovid's spondaic period; it precedes the first *Amores* and also three or four other works belonging to the *carmina iuvenalia*.

II. Transition from Sulpicia Elegies to *Amores*. Spondaic Character of First *Amores*

The percentage of dactyls and of dactylic beginnings which the juvenile poems of Ovid exhibit may be seen in a summary form from the table below. In the case of elegiac verse the percentage is here given for the whole distich, that is, it has been obtained by combining the first four feet of the hexameter and the first two feet of the pentameter; in the case of epic verse, the percentage is for the first four feet of the hexameter. In the Lygdamus elegies, since the style of the youthful poet is still imperfectly formed and he vacillates between two proportions, I give the six Lygdamus elegies first as a whole and secondly as forming two groups. It will be found that the second group (4 and 5) gives results almost

²¹ *Trist.* I, 2, 77: nec peto, quas quondam petii studiosus, Athenas.

²² Etsi me vario iactatum laudis amore

Irritaque expertum fallacis praemia vulgi

Cecropius suavis exspirans hortulus auras

Florentis viridi sophiae complectitur umbra. — *Ciris*, 1-4.

²³ Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, and Epicurus; cf. *Ciris*, 15: sapientia . . . quatuor antiquis heredibus edita consors.

²⁴ *Ciris*, 12-41. The plan was later fulfilled probably in the *Aetna* (the language of which I have not yet examined in all its details) and in the proemium and fifteenth book of the *Metamorphoses*, also perhaps in the lost *Phaenomena* and in parts of the *Fasti*.

identical with the Sulpicia letters. The figures for the *Panegyric* and the *Ciris* are those of Ehrengruber (*op. cit.* x, 5 and 21). The *Aetna*, which, according to every probability, is also the work of Ovid, is omitted from the comparison only because the exact figures are not accessible to me at the present writing; its proportions are, however, not very different from those of the *Ciris*. There appears to be conclusive evidence for including also the *Culex*, though I was long prevented from examining the language of this poem by erroneous impressions that I had at first formed respecting the treatment of the caesura in this work. Finally, Pliny, *N.H.* xxxii, 152, was wholly mistaken in his conjecture ("fortassis") that the *Halieutica* relates to the "fish of the Black Sea" and was consequently written at the close of the poet's life; the *schemata* show conclusively that the poem, wholly dependent as it is upon Greek books, belongs to the Lygdamus and Sulpicia period.

THE JUVENILE WORKS OF OVID

	Catalept. IX. 62 vss.	Halieut. 130 hex.	Lygdamus, all six elegies. ²⁵ 290 vss.	Lygdamus, four elegies, 1, 2, 3, 6. 160 vss.	Lygdamus, two elegies, 4, 5. 130 vss.	Sulpicia Letters, IV, 7-12. 40 vss.
SS. Dact. ²⁶	53 44.8	222 42.8	359 41.3	216 45.0	144 36.9	45 37.5
SS. Spond.	75 55.2	298 57.2	511 58.7	264 55.0	246 63.1	75 62.5
I. ²⁷ Dact.	46 71.9	62 47.7	166 57.2	101 63.1	65 50.0	20 50.0
I. Spond.	18 28.1	68 52.3	124 42.8	59 36.9	65 50.0	20 50.0

	Sulpicia Elegies, IV, 2-6; also IV, 13-14. 142 vss.	Cornutus Elegy [Tib.] II, 2. 22 vss.	Messalinus, Elegy, [Tib.] II, 5. 122 vss.	Panegyric. 211 hex.	Ciris. 527 hex.	Culex. 410 hex.
SS. Dact.	202 47.4	33 50.0	171 46.7	379 44.9	916 43.5	781 47.6
SS. Spond.	224 52.6	33 50.0	195 53.3	465 55.1	1192 56.5	859 52.4
I. Dact.	99 69.7	18 81.8	95 77.8	143 67.7	352 66.8	275 67.1
I. Spond.	43 30.3	4 18.2	27 22.2	68 32.3	175 33.2	135 32.9

²⁵ The figures are from Kleemann, *op. cit.* 29 f.

²⁶ Summa dactylorum.

²⁷ First foot.

A few words of explanation may be added to the tabular statement. Ovid began in *Catalepton*, IX with a proportion of dactyls which was wholly normal in the year 27 B.C. Thus he has 44.8% in the whole distich, which is as good as the second and third books of Propertius,²⁸ as good also as the eighth and third elegies of Tibullus' first book.²⁹ Yet he has no limitations whatever in *Catalepton*, IX upon polysyllabic endings in the pentameter; on the contrary, like Catullus and like Propertius in his earlier work, he fairly revels in their use (50%). In the Lygdamus elegies, however, and in the Sulpicia letters, the ambitious and aspiring youth seeks suddenly to pass from the longer endings to the more elegant dissyllables of Tibullus, and is evidently preoccupied with this problem and its difficulties. Under these conditions throughout the Lygdamus poems he wavers greatly in his composition, and, in one hundred and seventy verses (Lygd. 4 and 5, [Tib.] IV, 7-12), he even sinks to the proportion of Catullus, namely, about 37% in the distich, and to only 50% of dactylic beginnings.³⁰ This is of course excellent Latin elegy, but it is not the kind that was most in vogue in 24 B.C.³¹ It is only in the qualified or limited sense just ex-

²⁸ Propertius has 44.8% and 44.7% in the second and third books respectively. My figures are taken from Hultgren, *op. cit.* 23, who follows the five-book division of Propertius.

²⁹ Tibullus has 44.8% in the eighth elegy (Pholoe) for the whole distich and 45% in the third elegy. It is scarcely fanciful to see in the decline of dactyls in the third elegy an expression of Tibullus' sadness and depression of feeling during his illness at Corcyra; we have the same phenomenon in Lygdamus' fifth elegy. My figures are taken from Cartault, *Le distique élégiaque chez Tibulle, Sulpicia, Lygdamus* (Paris, 1911), 7.

³⁰ Figures for Catullus are given by Hultgren, *op. cit.* 15 ff. Catullus has usually 58% to 60% of dactylic beginnings, but in *Carm.* 69-119 (319 vss.) he has 36.6% of dactyls in the distich and only 47% of dactylic beginnings.

³¹ Catullus wrote some of the best Latin elegy, and the naturalness and directness of his style is due in part to his not exceeding the proportion named. As I have shown in my "Licensed Feet in Latin Verse," *op. cit.* 251-272, even the best Latin poets, such as Catullus and Horace, experience some difficulty in always providing one *required* dactyl, and *therefore* they occasionally admit without metrical ambiguity in such a foot exceptional or vulgar shortenings and even *short vowels (without m) in hiatus*, as Lucilius, IX, 243 Bähr.,

plained that Ovid can be said to have ever been a disciple of Catullus in the matter of dactylic proportions, but undoubtedly in his youth he paid this brief tribute to the freer and more natural style of his great predecessor. A secondary cause for the low proportion may perhaps be found in the sad and almost despairing character of the two elegies.

It will be noted that Ovid advanced in the Sulpicia and Messalinus poems which are composed in the elegiac metre to about 47% of dactyls in the whole distich; the hexameter lines alone of these poems show 46.1% and 45.9% respectively. On the other hand, the hexameters of purely epic poems like the *Ciris* fall back to 43.5%, which is normal for epic verse

o⁶re cōrupto (necessary dactyl of the hexameter); Lucr. VI, 1133, natu⁵ra cōruptum; Cat. 10, 26, istos cōmmodā; nám volo ád Sarápim (necessary dactyl of the Phalaecean); Hor. *Carm.* III, 14, 11, iám virum éxpertáe, malē óminátis (*short vowel in hiatus*, necessary dactyl of the Sapphic); Pers. 3, 66, dí¹scitē, ó miseri (license of the first foot, with greatly preferred dactyl); Luxorius, 302, 4, magnum depre⁵nderē usum. If difficulty is experienced in supplying one required dactyl for the Sapphic or the hexameter, it is clear that two necessary dactyls, as in the pentameter, constitute a very exacting demand upon the Roman language, and if the virtuosity is also insisted upon, a very elegant but very artificial form of verse is the result. For example, for metrical reasons, Ovid (like Tibullus) constantly uses *ab arte* and similar phrases drawn from the vulgar language, with its analytical tendency, instead of the simple ablative, and he also uses, by poetic license, to an unparalleled extent, the simple ablative for the ablative of the agent with *ab*, as *Her.* 4, 64, cáptā paré⁵ntē sorór, 'my sister was captivated by your parent,' where neither *parenti* nor *a parente* could enter the verse; upon the whole subject see in part Guttman, *Sogenannte instrumentales ab bei Ovid*, Dortmund, 1890. I was mistaken therefore in my former discussion (p. 271) in thinking that Ovid had perhaps actually used the spelling *parente* for the dative *parenti*, as he so often uses *mare* and *caeleste* for *mari* and *caelesti*, and as Statius, *Silv.* IV, 2, 28, uses *glaucae* certantia Do⁵ridē saxa, and Propertius, V (IV), 8, 10, writes cum temere anguino creditur o⁵rē manus (Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre*, I³, 301). The honest 37% of Catullus and Lygdamus does not compel a resort to such unusual constructions, and is therefore by no means to be despised. Dissen and Postgate (*Selections from Tibullus*, p. XLIII), on purely subjective grounds and without consulting indices, lexicons, or Latin authors, have discovered that Lygdamus is an author of "poor Latinity." On the contrary, his Latinity is more natural and in some respects better than that of the mature Ovid. Yet even the latter — like Euripides, an unrivalled master of the graceful and pleasing forensic style — could give most of us lessons in correct Latinity to our great and lasting profit.

and almost precisely the proportion of Vergil. In fact that strange and anomalous thing, the actual preponderance of dactyls in a Latin epic poem, could never by any possibility arise in the more vigorous epic hexameter (*versus fortis* or *gravis*); it must appear first in the soft and tender strains of the elegy (*versus mollis* or *levis*), and may be transferred thence to epic verse, as Ovid transferred it in the *Metamorphoses* and Valerius Flaccus later employed it in imitation of Ovid. Even Ovid in his mature period has recognized this difference to some extent; for the hexameter of elegy in the *Heroides* (first series) reaches 56.4%, while the epic hexameter of the *Metamorphoses* does not exceed 54.8%.

It is evident then that in the first edition of the *Amores* which was published in 14 B.C.,³² only a few years after the Sulpicia elegies, the *Ciris*, and the *Aetna*, Ovid had had little opportunity to develop a marked dactylic virtuosity and to become a highly artistic elegiac poet. We may be sure then that the first *Amores* of 14 B.C. showed only a very moderate advance upon the 47.4% of the Sulpicia elegies, and they may even have contained, like the latter, a few polysyllabic endings in the pentameter. Up to 14 B.C. Ovid was in fact fully as much an epic as an elegiac poet (see *Am.* I, 1, 1-18 on his early ambition to excel in epic themes), and he was still far from having attained in the Sulpicia poems the high virtuosity which appears in three of the four genuine elegies of Tibullus' second book, namely, 55% or more.³³ Two of the short Sulpicia elegies and the equally short Cornutus poem show, it is true, an equal or a superior number of dactyls,³⁴ but four Sulpicia poems and the long Messalinus elegy

³² Schanz, *op. cit.* 270 (§ 293), suggests that these elegies probably came first separately before the public, but later were collected in the edition of 14 B.C. This seems quite probable, especially as the spondaic *Amores* show in general the predominance of the same *schemata* or figures of the hexameter as the Sulpicia and Messalinus poems.

³³ The first elegy of the second book has 55.2% in the distich, the third has 50%, the fourth 55%, and the sixth 56.8%; see the figures of Cartault, *op. cit.* 7, and Ehrenguber, *op. cit.* x, 5.

³⁴ IV, 6 (20 vss.) has 50% of dactyls; IV, 5 (20 vss.) 58.3%; II, 2 (20 vss.) 50%.

(II, 5) have a decided preponderance of spondees. A marked change in Ovid's whole attitude took place, however, after 14 B.C. For unlike the *Ciris* and the *Aetna*, which did not greatly increase their author's reputation, the *Amores*, immediately upon their first publication, achieved a prodigious success; they at once became popular favorites, and, like the *Eclogues* of Vergil, were frequently sung in the theatre with accompanying dance (*Trist.* II, 519; V, 7, 25). The favorable reception thus accorded to the elegies naturally determined the direction of the poet's genius and led him to devote himself uninterruptedly (with the exception of the tragedy of *Medea*) for sixteen years (14 B.C. to 2 A.D.) to the perfection of an elegiac style which surpassed even the later work of Tibullus.

Having developed a remarkable and distinctive technique in the *Heroides* and the *Ars*, Ovid resolved to make the first *Amores* conform fully to his later rules of art. The revision was not due to the fact that this popular and successful work was poetically immature, nor even chiefly to the desire to add a series of new elegies; as he himself tells us in the prefixed epigram, the question was primarily one of more careful finish and elaboration: "hoc illi praetulit auctor opus" (cf. Gruppe, *op. cit.* 377). In brief, his principal purpose was to eliminate all polysyllabic endings, to introduce everywhere the full dactylic virtuosity, to multiply the dactylic beginnings, and to remove or greatly reduce those *schemata*, such as *DSSS*, *SDSS*, *SSSS*, *SS*, *SD*, and the like, which were no longer fully acceptable. The view adopted by Heuwer in his discussion of the matter (*op. cit.* 31) is that the revision "consisted in here and there substituting a word that was more suitable for one that was less suitable to the metre and sense, or in changing the collocation of words or verses, or in doing all these things at the same time." These conclusions are partly correct, but there can be no doubt that both the additions and the alterations were far more extensive and thoroughgoing than Heuwer supposes. The first edition

was in fact subjected to a drastic revision and was almost entirely rewritten in conformity to the new rules of art.³⁵

Nevertheless abundant traces of the character of the first edition still remain; for in not a few cases the poet has triumphed over the versifier and the artist, and a number of the original poems of the first edition have been retained with very moderate changes. This fact may be shown very clearly in two ways, if the writer correctly understands the true nature of Ovidian versification. For the full and harmoniously developed virtuosity in the Ovidian sense means first that there shall be a considerable preponderance of dactyls in the distich taken as a whole, and secondly that there shall be a similar preponderance of dactyls in each member taken singly, that is, in both the hexameter and the pentameter lines. It is evident therefore that virtuosity is lacking in the *Amores* in two ways: (1) when the spondees are either equal or predominant in the whole distich; (2) when they are equal or predominant in the hexameter line (*versus fortis* or *durus*) alone. With this understanding of the nature of virtuosity, I may summarize the facts briefly as follows. A considerable part of the second edition is entirely new and consists of such newly written elegies as II, 17 and 18; III, 1 and 15; and also the last 18 lines of III, 9 (the epicedion upon Tibullus).³⁶ A still larger part has been completely or almost completely revised in order to bring the elegies up to practically the same virtuosity as the

³⁵ The extraordinary importance which the mature Ovid attached to formal polish and elegance is not only evident from the exacting rules which he strictly observes, but also from his own express statements. Thus he speaks of destroying many works which would have won popular favor, but which he himself considered "faulty" (*vitiosa*, *Trist.* IV, 10, 61), he often laments that the poems of the exile are composed with less care and skill than was his wont (*Pont.* I, 5, 15 ff.; 57 ff.), and he bitterly complains that the *Metamorphoses* were uncorrected and lacked the finishing touches at the moment of his banishment, as in *Trist.* III, 14, 21, *illud opus . . . nunc incorrectum populi pervenit in ora*. See also *ib.* I, 7, 27 ff., *defuit et scriptis ultima lima meis*; I, 7, 39 ff.; II, 555.

³⁶ On the new elegies, see also Schanz, *op. cit.* 270 (§ 293).

Ars or the *Heroides* (first series), namely, 57% in the distich;³⁷ about a fourth part of the whole edition, however, shows only slight and moderate changes from its original form. That is, of the forty-nine elegies,³⁸ fourteen have been only partially and imperfectly revised. A single poem of 66 verses (III, 8) remains at practically the same average as the Sulpicia elegies, namely, 47.98% of dactyls in the distich; four other poems, however, of 184 verses (I, 2. 13. 15; III, 10) remain with the dactyls subordinate in the hexameter line, and either equal (only 50%) or subordinate (49.23%) in the whole distich. Five elegies (I, 14;³⁹ II, 4. 8. 11; III, 3), of 236 verses, also remain with the dactyls either subordinate or equal in the hexameter line, and with 52.4, 50.7, 51.2, 50.6, 50.7% respectively in the whole distich. Two elegies (II, 12. 14) of 72 verses, show a weak pentameter and only 51.2 and 52.3% in the distich; two other elegies (III, 14 and the first three-fourths of III, 9, the epicedion on Tibullus, composed in 19 B.C.), with 100 verses, are also low in their proportion of dactyls, namely, 53.3 and 51.3%. Furthermore, very largely the same identical *schemata* are predominant in all these elegies as we find preferred in the Sulpicia elegies (IV, 2-6) and in the imitation of Tibullus (IV, 13). Thus fourteen elegies of 658 verses — more than one-fourth of the total number — conspicuously lack the virtuosity; among these are included some of the most notable poems in the collection, such as I, 2 (the poet's willing submission to Love), I, 13 (Aurora and Tithonus), I, 14 (Corinna's use of dyes), I, 15 (epilogue on the immortality of poesy), II, 4 (reasons for love), II, 11 (lament over Corinna's voyage),

³⁷ 56.9% in the *Ars* (Drobisch), and 57.6% in the *Heroides*.

³⁸ There are really fifty elegies, as Gruppe, *op. cit.* 377, first pointed out, and as Ehwald, the latest editor, obtains, by breaking up II, 9 into two poems. In order, however, to avoid confusion and to be uniform with the results of Hultgren and Drobisch, my statistics (like theirs) are everywhere based upon the edition of Merkel, Leipzig, 1887.

³⁹ This is the poem which, through its reference to the subjugation of the Sigambri (15 B.C.), dates the whole original collection.

II, 12 (Corinna's surrender), II, 14 (the evils of abortion, with several Lygdamus verses repeated), III, 3 (Corinna's perjuries unpunished), III, 9 (epicedion on Tibullus, 50 out of 68 verses), III, 14 (Corinna's infidelities best unknown). The percentage of the nine 'imperfect' elegies of Books I and III is 50.5% of dactyls for the whole distich, of the five 'imperfect' elegies of Book II, 51.1%, and the difference between the perfect and the imperfect parts of the second *Amores* is 6% for the four poems of Book I, 5.3% for the five of Book II, and 4.8% for the five of Book III.⁴⁰ I think it quite reasonable, however, to assume that, even in the case of the imperfect elegies, at least 2.3% of dactyls have been added in the revision, and I thus reach the conclusion that the percentage of the first *Amores* did not exceed 48.5% of dactyls for the whole distich, and therefore rose only slightly above the 47.4% of the Sulpicia elegies and of IV, 13-14.

Though less important than the sum of the dactyls, the proportion of dactylic beginnings also requires mention. The percentage of dactylic beginnings in both hexameter and pentameter in *Am.* I is 80; in the four imperfect elegies (I, 2. 13. 14. 15) it is 73.4, in the remainder of the book it is 82.2, thus giving a difference of 8.8% between the two parts. We may consider as normal for the mature Ovid the percentage in both hexameter and pentameter of the *Ars*, which is 82.3, or that of the *Fasti*, which is 84.2. Similarly the percentage of dactylic beginnings in the whole of *Am.* II is 78.6; in the five imperfect elegies (II, 4. 8. 11. 12. 14)⁴¹ it is 71.6, in the remainder of the book it is 80.9, giving a difference of 9.3% between the two parts. With these five elegies of *Am.* II we may fitly compare not only the percentage of the Sulpicia elegies (IV, 2-6) and IV, 13-14, which is 69.7% in 142 verses, but also that of the early *Medicamen Faciei* frag-

⁴⁰ In the case of III, 9, the Tibullus epicedion, only the first 50 verses out of 68 are used.

⁴¹ II, 9 is also spondaic if we cut out the six verses (23-28) which Ovid seems to have added in the second edition in order to join the originally separate poems 9 and 9 B.

ment of 100 verses, which is 70, while its percentage of dactyls for the distich is also low, namely, 53.5.⁴² The percentage of dactylic beginnings in the whole of *Am.* III is 77.1; in the four imperfect elegies (III, 8. 10. 14, first 50 vs. of 9) it is 74, in the remainder of the book it is 78.5, giving a difference of 4.5 between the two parts. I consider this brief summary of usage affecting the first foot sufficient for the practical purposes of the present study, and in my subsequent discussion shall purposely omit this feature of the single elegies from the tabular statements. I may add, however, that the percentage of dactyls in the first foot in *Catalepton*, IX is 71.9; owing to preoccupation with the dissyllabic close and to imitation of Catullus, it sinks in the Lygdamus elegies to 55.8⁴³ and in the Sulpicia letters (IV, 7-12, 40 verses) to 50; it rises again to 67.7 in the *Panegyric*, 66.8 in the *Ciris*, and 67.1 in the *Culex*.⁴⁴

⁴² Hultgren, *op. cit.* 28 ff., argues that no importance should be attached to so small a fragment, yet at the same time (pp. 32 f.) shows the greatest uneasiness because of its evidence, apparently fearing that it may bring to naught the whole elaborate fabric of Ovidian virtuosity. One wonders what he would have thought if he had examined the single *Amores*.

⁴³ It varies greatly in single Lygdamus elegies from 82.2, 61.8, and 65.7 in 1, 5, and 6 to 53.4, 55.2, and 45.8 in 2, 3, and 4. In the technical *Halieutica* it sinks also to 47.7.

⁴⁴ On account of the length of the article it has been found necessary to omit here five tables giving exact statistics for the fourteen elegies. Two articles, which continue the present study and treat the language and *schemata* of Book IV of the Tibulline Corpus, will be published shortly in the *American Journal of Philology*.

XII. — *The 'Αρχίλοχοι of Cratinus and Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος*

BY PROFESSOR ROLLIN H. TANNER

DENISON UNIVERSITY

IN no country, not even in free America, has freedom of speech been more fully enjoyed than in Greece during the time of the Old Comedy. Every event in the life of the great statesmen of that time was made the subject of the ridicule of the comic poets, who were as merciless in their attacks as are the cartoonists of our day. Probably no poet of the Old Comedy, not even Aristophanes, was so keen and so severe as Cratinus in lampooning the shortcomings of public men. This characteristic appears strongly in his *'Αρχίλοχοι*, which is probably the earliest of his comedies from which we have fragments. The play takes its name from the great 'inventor'¹ of iambic verse, renowned for his biting sarcasm and his satire. A reading of the fragments will show how thoroughly the namesake breathes the spirit of the great iambic poet.

Concerning the date of the *'Αρχίλοχοι* there has been substantial agreement among scholars.² In a fragment (1 K) quoted from this play by Plutarch, *Cim.* 10,³ we have a reference to the death of Cimon, which occurred in the second

¹ The ancient tradition that Archilochus invented iambic verse is not to be interpreted literally, according to modern criticism. Cf. Hauvette, *Archiloque*, 136.

² Bergk, *Commentationum de reliquiis comoediae Atticae libri II*, 20; Meineke, *Frag. Com. Gr.* II, 25-26; Kock, *Com. Att. Frag.* I, 11; Zelle, *De comoediarum Gr. saec. quint. aetatum temporibus definiendis*, 9; Clinton, *Fast. Hell.* 55; Leo, *Quaest. Aristoph.* 19; Muhl, *Zur Gesch. d. alt-att. Kom.* 63.

³ *κἀγὼ γὰρ ἤχουν Μητρόβιος ὁ γραμματεὺς
σὺν ἀνδρὶ θείῳ καὶ φιλοξενωτάτῳ
καὶ πάντ' ἀρίστῳ τῶν Πανελλήνων πρώτῳ
Κίμωνι λιπαρὸν γῆρας εὐωχούμενος
αἰῶνα πάντα συνδιατρίψειν. ὁ δὲ λιπὼν
βέβηκε πρότερος.*

half of the year 449.⁴ This reference is of such an intimate nature that it would be timely only within a short time after the death of the admired statesman (cf. Bergk, *op. cit.* 20). Bergk was therefore led to date the play soon after Olympiad 82, 3 (450/449), and his conclusion has been generally accepted, with a strong tendency on the part of many to follow Clinton in assigning the play definitely to the year 448.

There is however a scholium on Luc. *Jup. trag.* 48, which, when rightly understood, will not only materially assist us in fixing the date definitely, but will also illustrate the poet's fondness for invective and for the ridicule of prominent men. This rather troublesome passage contains four statements about a certain Callias which we need to consider:

1. ὁ μὲν Καλλίας οὗτος, ὡς Κρατῖνος Ἀρχιλόχοις φησὶν, Ἰππονίκου υἱὸς ἦν τὸν δῆμον Μελιτεὺς,

2. ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης Ὀραις, πλούσιος καὶ πασχητιῶν καὶ ὑπὸ πορνιδίων διαφορούμενος καὶ κόλακας τρέφων.

3. εἰς⁵ δὲ στιγματίαν αὐτὸν Κρατῖνος κωμῶδεῖ ὡς ἓνα τῶν κατάχρεων· οἱ γὰρ δανειζόμενοι τὰς κτήσεις ὑπετίθεσαν καὶ ἐπέγραφον αὐτὰς πρὸς τὸ γινώσκεσθαι, ὅτι ὑποθήκαί εἰσιν.

4. κωμῶδεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν Κρατῖνος καὶ ὡς Φώκου γυναῖκα μοιχεύσαντα καὶ τρία τάλαντα δόντα εἰς τὸ μὴ κριθῆναι.

In the passage in Lucian to which this scholium applies, ἐν ὅσοις δὲ ἀγαθοῖς Καλλίας καὶ Μειδίας καὶ Σαρδανάπαλλος ὑπερτρυφῶντες καὶ τῶν ὑφ' αὐτοῖς καταπτύοντες, it seems probable that the Callias referred to is the famous *δαδοῦχος λακκόπλουτος*,⁶ a contemporary of Cimon, and the wealthiest man of his generation in ancient Athens. His wealth was said to have amounted to two hundred talents (Lys. 19, 48), and this fortune, accumulated by him and conserved and increased

⁴ Thuc. I, 112, 1-4; Diod. XII, 4, 6; Plut. *Cim.* 19; Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.*² III, 1, 342; Meyer, *Forsch.* II, 14 f.

⁵ Professor Capps has suggested that the usual language of the scholia would favor the reading ὡς δὲ κτλ.

⁶ Plut. *Arist.* 5, 25; Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 64; *Frag. Hist. Gr.* v, 15; Suid. *λακκόπλουτον*; Photius, *λακκόπλουτον*; Hesych. *λακκόπλουτος*.

by his son Hipponicus, was the largest fortune possessed by any Greek family of the fifth century.⁷

The grandson of this Callias was, of course, also an exceedingly wealthy man, but he squandered his fortune and spent the last years of his life in penury and died a pauper.⁸ His outstanding characteristics are those of a spendthrift, while the name of his grandfather became a synonym for wealth.⁹ In the passage in Lucian from which the above quotation is taken Damis is complaining of Zeus's poor management in letting the noblest men of the world go unrewarded for their good deeds and heaping up luxury and pleasure for those who do not deserve it. Socrates, Aristides, and Phocion are cited as examples of the former and Callias, Midias, and Sardanapallus of the latter. It is hardly to be thought that the Callias referred to by Lucian is the man who reaped the reward of his extravagance and haughtiness. This certainly would not be an apt illustration of the point Lucian is trying to make. The *λακκόπλουτος* has a much better claim to a place in this triumvirate of wealth.

From several ancient references to Callias *ὁ λακκόπλουτος* we learn that the charge contained in the words *ὑπερτροφῶντες καὶ τῶν ὑφ' αὐτοῖς καταπτύοντες* exactly fits his character. Plutarch, *Arist.* 5, 5 f.; calls him *ὠμότατος ἀνθρώπων καὶ παρανομώτατος*, and says (*Arist.* 25, 3-6), on the authority of Aeschines the Socratic,¹⁰ that he was

⁷ Plut. *Cim.* 4; *Arist.* 25; Andoc. 1, 130; Lys. 19, 48; Nepos, *Alcib.* 2, 1; Isoc. 16, 31.

⁸ Ar. *Eccl.* 810 and Schol.; Ath. 537 b-c.

⁹ Aeschines Socraticus in Plut. *Arist.* 25; Max. Tyr. 39, 5 f.; Lys. 19, 48; Andoc. 1, 130.

¹⁰ Müller-Strübing, *Aristoph. u. d. hist. Kritik*, 584, in his disparagement of Aeschines the Socratic, is unduly influenced by Athenaeus and Lysias. Athenaeus, 220 a-c, e, calls Aeschines a slanderer. But, as every one knows, Athenaeus himself is much given to retailing slander, and in this passage he is especially interested in maintaining his thesis that the philosophers are worse slanderers than the comic poets. Furthermore the statements which he attributes to Aeschines are no worse than those which might be attributed to very many other ancient writers to prove that they were slanderers. Athenaeus makes out Socrates and Plato to be just as bad if not worse than Aeschines

accused of allowing his cousin Aristides, with his wife and children, to be destitute of the very necessities of life, although he himself was the richest man in Athens and had often profited by his cousin's influence with the Athenian people. And although, at Callias' request, Aristides came forward and denied the charge, this accusation would not have had the great influence which it seems to have had with the judges, if Callias had had a reputation for generosity. Lucian, *Tim.* 24, thinks that Callias did not deserve his wealth and contrasts him with Aristides. He makes Plutus say that if he had had his sight and had been able to see where he was going, he would never have left Aristides and gone over to Hipponicus and Callias.

Nepos, *Cim.* 1, 3, describes Callias, the husband of Elpinice, who is rightly identified with ὁ λακκόπλουτος¹¹ by Kirchner (*Prosopogr.* 7825), as "non tam generosus quam pecuniosus," and Dio Chrysostomus, *Or.* 73 (56), 6, 11, 190 Von Arnim,

(cf. 219 a-f, 220 e-f), but any statement quoted on the authority of Socrates or Plato would be accepted at once as worthy of the highest credence. Lysias' invective against Aeschines, quoted by Athenaeus, 611 d-612 e, occurs in a speech which Lysias delivered in a case against Aeschines for a debt. Welcker ("Unächtheit d. Rede d. Lys. g. d. Soc. Aesch.," *Kl. Schr.* 1, 412, 430 = *Rh. Mus.* 11 (1834), 391-410) denies the genuineness of this speech of Lysias on the ground that these charges are too much out of harmony with what we know of the life of Aeschines. For (1) one would gain a high opinion of his character from his writings, as both Lysias and Athenaeus admit; (2) the testimonies to his character are the best; (3) he was intimately associated with Socrates and his school, and was one of the few close friends who were present at his death; and (4) he wrote against the very vices of which he is accused by Lysias in his speech. Besides, Lysias is not given to such unfounded slander. But even if the speech were to be regarded as genuine, we must remember that Lysias was pleading a case in court, and that such abuse was a common means of winning a case in his day. Further, even if Aeschines were a slanderer and a dissolute fellow, he would probably be correct in a historical allusion given merely by way of illustration, and dealing with men who lived long before his day, and in whom he probably had no especial personal interest. Besides, this allusion occurs in his writings, which were admitted even by Lysias and Athenaeus to be of a high order.

¹¹ In an article entitled "Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος, the Husband of Elpinice," which I now have ready for publication, I believe I have established this identification beyond a reasonable doubt.

calls him ταπεινός. Kraft, in Pauly, *Realencyclopädie*, II, 79-80, and Boeckh, *Staatsh. d. Ath.* I³, 568, interpret the expressions "non tam generosus quam pecuniosus" and ταπεινός as implying an obscure origin, but our lexica give evidence of the use of *generosus* and ταπεινός as referring to moral character, and this possibility is also recognized by Bossler, *De gent. et fam. Atticae sacerdotalibus*, 34, n. 16. *Generosus*, 'highborn,' came to denote also those qualities of noble-mindedness and generosity which were usually indicative of high birth. Now Nepos does not state that Callias was not highborn; his antithetical paronomasia says only that his high birth was not so outstanding a characteristic of him as his wealth, and in the subtle litotes which is involved in the same expression, Nepos gives us his opinion that Callias fell far short of the nobility of character which was to have been expected from his noble birth. It is not unlikely that Dio Chrysostomus, whose long residence at Rome and intimacy with court circles must have given him a wide acquaintance with Roman literature, has used Nepos as his source for the illustration in which he refers to Callias as ταπεινός. Every detail of his statement has its almost exact parallel in Nepos' *Miltiades* or in the passage cited above from his *Cimon*. Undoubtedly then we shall be correct in regarding ἀνδρὶ ταπεινῷ καὶ χρήματα ἔχοντι as a translation of "non tam generosus quam pecuniosus." The word ταπεινός, which is used to describe that which is on a *lower level*, may be applied to place, rank, feelings, or character. In the light of the foregoing considerations either Dio is using the word in reference to character or, in condensing the account for the purpose of his illustration, he has not grasped the real significance of Nepos' expression. The other evidence we have found regarding the character of Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος warrants us in understanding these terms "non tam generosus" and ταπεινός as referring to his character. He must therefore be the man to whom Lucian refers in the passage cited above (p. 173) and hence also the one to whom, according to the first statement

of the scholiast, Cratinus refers in the 'Αρχίλοχοι as the son of Hipponicus.¹²

But the second statement¹³ of the scholiast, according to which Aristophanes refers to Callias and his dissipations in the 'Ωραι, seems to be at variance with this interpretation of the first statement. For the notices we have about the life of the elder Callias (Kirchner, *Prosopogr.* 7825) indicate that he can hardly have been still living when Aristophanes began his career as a comic poet in 427,¹⁴ to say nothing of the later time when the 'Ωραι was probably produced. This fact is especially to be inferred from the information, which we have from two sources,¹⁵ that he was present at the battle of

¹² The conclusion of this statement of the scholiast, τὸν δῆμον Μελιτεύς, apparently disagrees with the fact, which we know from *I.G.* II, 1023, 31 and 43, that the Calliae and Hipponici were of the deme Ἀγκυλῆ. But Dittenberger, *Herm.* XX (1885), 5, n. 2, gives us an explanation which very satisfactorily accounts for this discrepancy: "Aber Schol. Arist. Ran. 501 wird vielmehr gesagt Καλλίας γὰρ ὁ Ἱππονίκου ἐν Μελίτῃ ᾤκει. Letztere Nachricht hat schon deshalb viel für sich, weil wir wissen, dass Melite ein von reichen und vornehmen Bürgern besonders gesuchtes Stadtquartier war; dann liegt aber die Vermuthung sehr nahe, dass auch in der Stelle aus Aristophanes' 'Ωραι (see note 13 below) nur von der Wohnung des Kallias die Rede war, und erst der Scholiast daraus auf die Gemeindeangehörigkeit geschlossen hat." He also shows that "die Worte οὐκ Μελίτης μαστιγίας bei Aristophanes sind für die vorliegende Frage ohne jede Bedeutung. Denn selbst auf Kallias bezogen, könnten sie ebenso gut die Wohnung, als die Heimathgemeinde andeuten; und überdies ist gewiss nicht Kallias, sondern Herakles gemeint." Cf. also Kirchner, *Herm.* XXXI (1896), 258 f.

¹³ In the text of Rabe's edition of the scholia on Lucian, which is undoubtedly the best authority we have today, there is no comma before τὸν δῆμον Μελιτεύς and no doubt this phrase is to be attributed to Cratinus rather than to Aristophanes. Even with the comma, as quoted by Kock for Cratinus, frag. 11, it would seem more natural to construe the phrase with what precedes. However, in Kock's citation of the scholium for Aristophanes, frag. 572 (I, 538), he seems to have followed Bergk (on Ar. 'Ωραι, frag. xiii, in Meineke, II, 1175) in placing a period after 'Ωραις, and Dittenberger in the passage cited above has done the same. If they are correct, we must then apply this phrase to the younger Callias. It is, of course, immaterial for the purpose of our argument to which Callias it applies.

¹⁴ Anon. *περὶ κωμωδίας*, 11, Kaibel, *Com. Gr. Frag.*, p. 8.

¹⁵ Schol. Ar. *Nub.* 64; Plut. *Arist.* 5. The argument of Petersen (*Quaest. de hist. gent. Att.* 40), "quaecumque ex his vera sunt, in Hipponicum patrem

Marathon, clad in his priestly robes as *δαδούχος*. It would, then, at first thought, seem that this second statement of the scholiast must refer to the grandson of *ὁ λακκόπλουτος*, who was notorious for the very sins indicated,¹⁶ and who was lampooned as a spendthrift and dissipated fellow by Aristophanes in the *Birds*, 284-286, *Frogs*, 432-434, and *Ecclesiazusae*, 810-811. The information given in the third and fourth statements of the scholiast also appears at first sight to be more in keeping with what we know of the character of the younger Callias, and this led Meineke, who agrees (*op. cit.* II, 220 f.) that the first citation from the scholiast refers to the elder Callias, to the conclusion (*op. cit.* II, 24), which Kock, *op. cit.* I, 15, accepts, that the rest of the scholium refers to the younger Callias. But since this younger Callias was in command of the Athenian hoplites at Lechaeum in 390,¹⁷ and was sent as an ambassador to Sparta in 371,¹⁸ he cannot have been old enough at the time of the production of the *Ἀρχίλοχοι* to have been lampooned as a spendthrift and adulterer (cf. Kock, *op. cit.* I, 111, frag. 333). The same conclusion is also reached from the fact that his father Hipponicus was not born until after the death of Miltiades, for at that time Hipponicus' mother Elpinice, as we are informed by Plutarch, *Cim.* 4, was still a girl and unwed. Busolt, *op. cit.* III, 1, 504, n. 2, says that the younger Callias cannot have been born much before 452. Both Meineke, *op. cit.* II, 220 f., and Kock, *Crat.* frag. 333, are therefore compelled to

ea potius quam in Calliam cadere censeo, cum temporum ratio vix permittat, ut eum, quem legatum anno 449 Susam missum esse videbimus, annis quadraginta antea daduchum fuisse statuamus," has no force whatsoever; for it is not at all inherently unlikely that a man in his thirties, or even earlier, should at the death of his father enter upon a priestly office, which was hereditary in his family, and that this same man in his seventies, or even later, should be still active enough to go from Athens to Sparta and participate in deliberations for the establishment of peace. Welzel (*Progr. Vratisl.* 1888, xi-xii) has no doubt that the passages above mentioned refer to the elder Callias.

¹⁶ For numerous references to this fact see Kirchner, *op. cit.* 7826.

¹⁷ Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* v, 254-255, and Kirchner, *op. cit.* 7826.

¹⁸ Xen. *Hell.* VI, 3, 2-3; Diod. xv, 50; Dion. H. *de Lys.* 12; Plut. *Ages.* 28.

assume that the third and fourth statements of the scholiast must refer to some other play or plays of Cratinus than the 'Αρχίλοχοι. If we accept this explanation we must assume that the scholiast has confused the elder and the younger Callias, and that the two passages quoted from Cratinus without the title of the play are from one or two of his later plays. That we are not to attempt to harmonize all four statements of the scholiast by assuming that the first statement also refers to the younger Callias, is shown not only by the argument of Bergk, *op. cit.* 21, that the Callias of the 'Αρχίλοχοι must have been a man who had already attained some prominence in order to be the object of the poet's ridicule, but also by the result secured above, that the passage in Lucian upon which this scholium is a comment undoubtedly refers to the elder Callias.

But when we examine very carefully the third statement, which refers to the debts of Callias, we find, as Bergk suggested (*l.c.*), a serious difficulty with the interpretation given above. For, although the younger Callias was a notorious spendthrift (cf. especially Andoc. 1, 130 f.), nevertheless at the time of the death of his father Hipponicus, which may have occurred near the close of the year 424,¹⁹ but surely did

¹⁹ [Andoc.] 4, 13: τελευτήσαντος Ἰππονίκου στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ Δηλίῳ. Cf. Thuc. iv, 89-101. The statement of the Pseudo-Andocides that Hipponicus met his death as a general in the battle of Delium has been regarded with suspicion because Thucydides does not mention that fact, and it has been thought that the name Hipponicus was probably confused with that of Hippocrates, who was the commanding general at Delium and lost his life in that battle. Petersen, *op. cit.* 43, accepts the statement of the Pseudo-Andocides as evidence that Hipponicus lost his life in that battle, but thinks that he was not there in the capacity of general. This view is also adopted by Welzel, *op. cit.* xx. Beloch, *Attische Politik seit Pericles*, 305, does not express himself on the question of the date of Hipponicus' death, but agrees with Petersen regarding the generalship, although he admits that "die Sache an sich nicht unmöglich wäre, wenn auch das Schweigen des Thukydides auffällt." Dittenberger, *op. cit.* 34, rejects the entire statement and thinks the error arose from the similarity of names and the fact that Hipponicus had held command in the same region two years before. This is also the opinion of Swoboda (Pauly-Wissowa, viii, 1908, s. v. *Hipponikos*) and probably of Busolt, *op. cit.* iii, 2, 1150 n. Kirchner, *op. cit.* 7658, accepts the statement as evidence for the death of

occur sometime between 426²⁰ and 421 (Ath. 218 b), he came into possession of a very large fortune,²¹ and while he immediately began to waste it in the most riotous fashion, so much so that the poet Eupolis made him the butt of his ridicule in the *Κόλακες*,²² produced in 421,²³ we do not find any reference to his 'financial embarrassment' until the time of the *Birds* (284-286 and Schol.), and it is after this time that most of the references to him as *κωμωδούμενος* are to be dated.²⁴ Thus we see that it is extremely unlikely that he should have been lampooned *ὡς ἓνα τῶν κατάχρεων* at any time by our poet Cratinus, whose last play, the *Πυτίνη*, was brought out in 423.²⁵ To assume that this was done by the younger Cratinus would be to attribute to the scholiast a confusion of the elder and younger Cratinus in addition to a confusion of the elder and younger Callias. There is, however, as Bergk has pointed out (*op. cit.* 22), an incident in the life of the elder Callias to which the scholiast's third statement might well refer. Demosthenes, 19, 273, tells us that although Callias made a celebrated peace with Persia, yet the Athenians, on the charge that he accepted a bribe

Hipponicus in the last half of 424 but expresses doubt about the generalship. The fact that the names Hipponicus and Hippocrates are somewhat similar and hence might possibly be confused is by no means evidence that they were so confused. The silence of Thucydides, although somewhat strange, can be explained on the assumption that Hippocrates had the chief command and that Hipponicus played a subordinate part. Hipponicus' successful operations at Tanagra two years before (cf. Thuc. III, 91 2nd Diod. XII, 65, 3) would afford a good reason for his reassignment to a command upon resumption of operations in the same region. Two names are lacking from the list of generals for this year (cf. Beloch, *Alt. Pol.* 291 f., 305 f.) and it is not impossible that Hipponicus was one of these two generals. The fact that he had died before 421 (Ath. 218 b) is also in harmony with this idea.

²⁰ Cf. the above-mentioned notices of his command at Tanagra in 426.

²¹ Lys. 19, 48 and Ath. 218 b.

²² Schol. Ar. *Av.* 284; Max. Tyr. 20, 7; Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* II, 110, 31 Kayser; also the fragments of the *Κόλακες*.

²³ Cf. Ar. *Pax* Argum. 1; Ath. 218 b.

²⁴ Cf. Kirchner, *op. cit.* 7826, and Pape, *Wörterb. d. gr. Eigennamen*, Καλλίας, 2, b, γ.

²⁵ Ar. *Nub.* Argum. v, and [Lucian], *Macrob.* 25.

in connection with the embassy to Persia, were almost ready to kill him, and imposed upon him a fine of fifty talents. A fine of this size may well have made it necessary for even so wealthy a man as Callias to borrow money on a mortgage. Both Bergk, *op. cit.* 21, and Meineke, who argues against Bergk's interpretation (*op. cit.* II, 221), fail to see that the explanation added by the scholiast in the statement we are considering shows in just what sense Callias is called *στιγματίας*, and fits the assumed case of the elder Callias exactly. No doubt Cratinus found great pleasure in taking advantage of the temporary embarrassment of the 'richest man' to ridicule him *ὡς ἓνα τῶν κατάχρεων*, and in calling him a 'marked man' because his name was posted among the mortgaged debtors. There is no indication of any such temporary 'financial embarrassment' of the younger Callias until long after the death of Cratinus.

Since, as we have seen, the passage just discussed probably refers to the elder Callias, we shall also undoubtedly be right in believing, with Bergk, *op. cit.* 22, that the last statement of our scholiast also refers to the elder Callias. We have no other information about Phocus except a remark at the end of this same scholium, *ὁ δὲ Φῶκος οὗτος μοιχαλίδα εἶχε γυναῖκα, ἐφ' ἧ καὶ ἐάλω Καλλίας*, which very likely is but an amplification of the statement under consideration. Nor do we know that the character of the elder Callias was above reproach in this respect. It may be that the lechery which made the younger Callias so notorious and which there is evidence to believe existed also in the life of his father Hipponicus,²⁶ was inherited from the grandsire. The fact that he held one of the two most sacred religious offices of the Eleusinian mysteries is no argument against this supposition; for his notorious grandson inherited the same office (Xen. *Hell.* VI, 3, 3) after he had become known as a scrapegrace,²⁷ and

²⁶ Plat. *Crat.* 384 B, 391 C; Xen. *Mem.* IV, 8, 4; *Apol.* 2; Petersen, *op. cit.* 46; Swoboda, *op. cit.* VIII, 1909.

²⁷ Andoc. I, 130-131. All the evidence goes to show that the office of

probably passed it on to his descendants (Dittenberger, *op. cit.* 10 and 22). Having determined that three of the statements (1, 3, 4) of our scholiast undoubtedly refer to Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος, we now need to make but one assumption, by no means impossible, in order to harmonize the entire scholium and save the reputation of our scholiast. May it not be that Aristophanes in the *Ῥραι*, in holding up to ridicule the sins of the younger Callias, took occasion to trace them back to the famous grandsire? But whatever may be the truth regarding the statement attributed to the *Ῥραι*, it cannot affect the validity of our argument concerning the statements assigned to Cratinus.

If then these three references (1, 3, 4) to Cratinus all concern the elder Callias, it would seem most likely, in view of the omission of the name of the play in the last two, that they are all derived from the *Ἀρχίλοχοι*. In reading the last statement we are struck at once by the rhythm of the closing words *τάλαντα δόντα εἰς τὸ μὴ κριθῆναι*. These words might, of course, fit more than one kind of verse. There is, however, a fragment (10 K) of the *Ἀρχίλοχοι* which, after the first three syllables, has exactly the same rhythm,

Ἐρασμονίδη Βάθιππε τῶν ἀωρολείων.

This verse, which imitates a verse of Archilochus (*P.L.G.* 11³, frag. 79),

Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε, χρῆμά τοι γελοῖον,

is cited by Hephaestion, xv, 7, with the statement that Cratinus, when he wrote it, did not understand this meter, and the scholium on the passage explains that he had wrongly substituted an iamb for an anapaest in the third place. Bergk's explanation (*op. cit.* 8) that the poet was hindered from following the meter accurately by the proper name *Βάθιππε*, does not form a valid excuse, because it was very easy to make the verse metrically correct by the insertion of a particle like *δέ*

δαδοῦχος was held for life and that there never were two persons holding this office at any one time. Cf. Dittenberger, *op. cit.* 20-22.

or γέ after Ἐρασμονίδη. Now the words τάλαντα δόντα εἰς τὸ μὴ κριθῆναι would need only an initial ∪ — ∪ to make a verse exactly corresponding to the fragment (10 K) cited above, showing the same error in the use of the meter, and the same ithyphallic close, which Hephaestion says (xv, 2) is characteristic of this meter. We need not be troubled by the hiatus which these words contain, for although it is rare, it does occur in many kinds of verse,²⁸ and in this verse it occurs between cola where the meter changes.²⁹ In explaining the origin of this meter, Hephaestion, xv, 2-6, says that Archilochus was the first to unite different kinds of cola in the same verse, that he formed this particular meter by uniting an anapaestic hephthemimer and an ithyphallic, and that Cratinus and other poets who came after Archilochus gave this verse a different metrical constitution and developed it into a true prosodiac tetrameter.³⁰ It is possible that our poet in the Ἀρχίλοχοι, which is probably the earliest of his plays from which any fragments have come down to us, is just beginning to be interested in this meter and has inadvertently omitted one mora. The other examples of the same meter which occur in the fragments of the poet³¹ are correct in this respect, or perhaps we had better say, show the final fixed form which the meter assumed in the hands of Cratinus and his contemporaries, and which, because of the peculiarly pleasing effect of its rhythm, became popular with the fifth-century comic poets (cf. White, *op. cit.* 223). The hiatus points to the time when the hephthemimer and the ithyphallic were regarded as distinct component elements or cola of the verse and before they were welded into a more

²⁸ Cf. Ar. *Vesp.* 298, 315; Crat. frag. 241.

²⁹ For examples of hiatus between cola, where the meter changes, cf. Ar. *Ran.* 262, 325, 1345; *Lys.* 1302; *Ach.* 336, 337, 341, 671; *Vesp.* 641; *Thesm.* 972.

³⁰ For a careful extended explanation of the origin of this meter, see White, *Verse of Greek Comedy*, 297-306.

³¹ Frag. 30, 57, 58, 323 K and perhaps the last verse of frag. 240 K. The explanation given above, of course, argues against Bergk's assignment (*op. cit.* 9-11) of frag. 323 K to the Ἀρχίλοχοι.

complete whole with a change in the usual place of the main pause. Is it not probable that the words apparently quoted by the scholiast belong to the same choral ode as the prosodiac verse quoted by Hephaestion?

These two fragments of Cratinus are alike not only in meter but also in thought. The mock patronymic *Ἐρασμονίδη* and the epithet *ἄωρολείων* might well be applied to Callias, the seducer of another man's wife. As we know nothing whatever of any Athenian of the fifth century by the name of *Βάθιππος*,³² perhaps this word is to be regarded as a nickname for Callias (cf. *Hipponicus*, the family name). The expression *Ἐρασμονίδη Βάθιππε*, 'Horsesport, son of Lecher,' might then refer to Callias, his wealth and fondness for horses, and his relations with women, *e.g.* the wife of Phocus. Or possibly *Βάθιππε* is a 'surprise' for *βαθυπλούσιος* or *βαθύπλουτος* and to be taken as an adjective, meaning 'horse-rich.' For Callias' interest in horses we have the statement of another scholium³³ that he won three victories in the chariot race at Olympia. If this explanation of the meaning of *Βάθιππε* is correct, we have in this word a corroboration of Hephaestion's statement that Cratinus, when he wrote this verse, did not understand this kind of meter, for the word ought more properly to be spelled *Βαθύϊππε* on the analogy of words like *βαθυαγκής* and *βαθυεργέω*. This spelling would have suited the meter exactly. For the use of this compound with the meaning indicated we have such parallels as *βαθυγήρως*, 'advanced in age,' *βαθύδενδρος*, 'deep-wooded, abounding in trees,' *βαθύδοξος*, 'far-famed,' *βαθύκαρπος*, 'rich in fruits,' and *βαθύπλουτος*, 'abounding in wealth.'

³² In the fourth century a man of this name brought suit to repeal the Lep-tinian law, on the ground that it was unconstitutional, and died during the progress of the trial. His son Apsephion continued the trial in 355/4, and in the interest of the prosecution Demosthenes made a speech (20). This is the only Athenian of this name of whom we have any record. Cf. *Kirchner, op. cit.* 2814. Of course it is not impossible that some ancestor of the same name is referred to in the fragment (10 K) of Cratinus.

³³ On *Ar. Nub.* 64. Cf. *Robert, Herm.* xxxv (1900), 177.

If it seems incredible to any one, in spite of Hephaestion's statement, that Cratinus, in the definite attempt to imitate the famous verse of Archilochus, should have misconceived the meter, it is possible to assume that he actually wrote

Ἐρασμονίδη Βαθυῖππε τῶν ἀωρολείων,

and that Hephaestion wrongly imputed to the ignorance of Cratinus what was the result of a very natural and easy error in the transmission of the text. In this case we should also have to suppose that our scholiast, in referring to Cratinus' statement about Callias and the wife of Phocus, has quoted somewhat freely from a passage containing some such verse as

τάλαντά γε μὴν τρία δόντα εἰς τὸ μὴ κριθῆναι,

or that the expression *τάλαντα δόντα εἰς τὸ μὴ κριθῆναι* is a trimetrical colon such as is often found associated with prosodiac verse (cf. White, *op. cit.* 218, § 485). In any case the similarity between the two fragments, both in subject matter and meter, is marked enough to lend a certain probability to our assignment of them to the same choral ode.³⁴ If the first and last statements of the scholiast are taken from the 'Αρχίλοχοι, it seems hardly probable that the third statement was derived from any other play.

If then the 'Αρχίλοχοι contained this reference to the debts of Callias, we can undoubtedly determine the date of the play to the year. After the death of Cimon in the autumn of 449, Callias went as an ambassador to Persia to treat for peace.³⁵ Although the peace which was arranged was a good one for Athens, we have seen (pp. 180 f.) that upon his return Callias was accused of accepting a bribe from the Persian king, and fined in the sum of fifty talents. Petersen, *op. cit.* 41, thinks that this treatment is inconsistent with the fact that the Athenians erected an altar of peace and a statue of Callias in commemoration of his services to the state on

³⁴ In content and meter still another fragment (4 K), εὐδοντι πρωκτὸς αἰρεῖ, might easily belong to the same ode.

³⁵ Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* III, 617-618; *Forsch.* II, 71-82; Busolt, *op. cit.* III, 1, 345-358.

this occasion,³⁶ and that Demosthenes, our authority for the story, has charged to the account of Callias the well-known fine of fifty talents which was imposed upon his father-in-law Miltiades, after his unsuccessful expedition to Paros,³⁷ and paid by Cimon after the death of Miltiades.³⁸ Welzel, however (*op. cit.* xvii f.), has defended and harmonized the two statements, that Callias made the celebrated peace with Persia and that he was fined fifty talents for bribery upon his return to Athens. Demosthenes was picking out an effective antithesis, and if he had invented the story of this fine for rhetorical purposes, Aeschines would hardly have failed to call him to account for it in his speech. The peace concluded by Callias was at the time really disappointing to the Athenian people (Meyer, *Forsch.* 18). In fact, however, it marked the end of the great struggle with Persia. Commerce began to flourish and the Athenian hegemony became stronger and stronger. It is not surprising that in later times it assumed an importance not attributed to it at the time. And besides, Boeckh³⁹ has shown that the statue of Callias and the altar of peace were not erected until after the time of Demosthenes. There is then absolutely no reason for doubting the truth of the statement as made by Demosthenes. Even though Callias was the wealthiest man in Athens, the imposition of so large a fine may well have caused him some temporary embarrassment and compelled him to borrow some money on a mortgage. This must have occurred immediately after his return, and the reference to it in Cratinus would be effective only within a very short time after the trial. That Callias was soon in high favor again is shown by the fact that he was a member of the important embassy which set out to Sparta in 446/5 and arranged the Thirty Years Peace.⁴⁰ It is impossible, however, that after the autumn of

³⁶ Plut. *Cim.* 13; Paus. 1, 8, 2.

³⁷ Hdt. vi, 136; Nep. *Mil.* 7. The siege of Paros probably occurred in 489. Cf. Busolt, *op. cit.* II, 598, and Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* v, 338.

³⁸ Cf. Hdt. vi, 136; Busolt, *op. cit.* III, 1, 91.

³⁹ *Die Staatsh. d. Ath.* I³, 453 c. Cf. also p. 313.

⁴⁰ Diod. xii, 7; Busolt, *op. cit.* III, 1, 436; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* III, 346 A.

449, the embassy of Callias to Susa, his return to Athens, and his trial, should all have taken place in time to permit the reference to him ὡς ἓνα τῶν κατὰχρεων in a play produced in the spring of 448. The trial undoubtedly took place in the summer or autumn of 448 and the Ἀρχίλοχοι must have been produced in the spring of 447.⁴¹ To assume a later date than this would be too late for the reference to the recent death of Cimon (cf. pp. 172 f. above). Furthermore, if, as seems likely, the Ἀρχίλοχοι attacked some of the new changes in the policy of the state which followed the death of Cimon, the spring of 448 would probably have been too early for their development, and the nature of the play would have made the death of Cimon seem sufficiently recent in the spring of 447.

We believe we have shown conclusively that the scholium on Luc. *Jup. trag.* 48, as well as the passage on which it is a comment, refers to Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος, and that the first, third, and fourth statements of this scholium are taken from the Ἀρχίλοχοι of Cratinus. This last conclusion is greatly strengthened by the fact that the closing words of the fourth statement of the scholium seem to be in the same meter as frag. 10 K of the Ἀρχίλοχοι, and this is the comparatively rare prosodiac meter. This fragment seems also to refer unmistakably to Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος. From the reference in the third statement of the scholium to Callias as a mortgaged debtor, which could apply to him only during a time of temporary financial embarrassment probably occasioned by the fine of fifty talents inflicted on him in the year 448, we are able with a good deal of certainty to place the production of the play in the spring of 447.

⁴¹ When Couat, *Arist. et l'anc. com. att.* 9, said, "Les Archiloques doivent avoir été représentés après le procès de Callias," he seems to have believed, for reasons not explained by him, that the statement of the scholiast regarding the debts of Callias was to be referred to the Ἀρχίλοχοι, but in dating the trial of Callias in 445 he must have followed Duncker, *op. cit.* v. 87, whose "sehr unglücklicher Gedanke, dass Demosthenes eine Verwechslung begangen habe und Kallias in Wirklichkeit wegen des dreissigjährigen Friedens mit Sparta 446, bei dem er nach Diod. xii, 7 einer der Untehändler war, verurtheilt sei," has been completely refuted by Meyer, *Forsch.* II, 81.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
HELD AT BALTIMORE, MD., DECEMBER, 1920
ALSO OF THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast
HELD AT SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., NOVEMBER, 1920

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
ADELBERT COLLEGE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

I. PROGRAMME

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 28

FIRST SESSION, 2 O'CLOCK P.M.

WILLIAM STUART MESSER

A Possible Source of the Dream in Pindar's Fourth Pythian

CATHARINE SAUNDERS

The Tragedy of Latinus ²

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE

Thermopylae and Artemisium (p. 5)

B. LAMAR CROSBY

Note on *Acharnians*, 803 (p. xiii)

JOHN DEAN BICKFORD

The Soliloquy in Ancient Comedy ³

ARTHUR L. KEITH

Homer, Vergil, and Milton in Their Use of Images from Nature
(read by title, p. xv)

JOINT SESSION WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

8 O'CLOCK P.M.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

Prophecy in the Epic: Annual Address of the President of the
Association ⁴

¹ To be published in the *Classical Weekly*, xv.

² To be published in the *Classical Weekly*.

³ Embodied in a doctor's dissertation of Princeton University, to appear in 1921 under the same title.

⁴ To be published in expanded form in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 29

SECOND SESSION, 9.30 O'CLOCK A.M.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING
The Tauric Maiden and Allied Cults (p. 40)ROLAND G. KENT
The Alleged Conflict of the Accents in Latin Verse (p. 19)HENRY S. SCRIBNER
The Idea of Law in Greek Poetry (p. xvii)EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY
Spontaneous Generation and Kindred Notions (p. 101)ROLLIN H. TANNER
The Ἀρχίλοχοι of Cratinus and Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος (p. 172)KARL P. HARRINGTON
The Roman Poet Laureate (p. xiv)ROBERT S. RADFORD
The Development of the Metrical Art of Ovid (read by title, p. 146)JOHN C. ROLFE
Prorsus (read by title, p. 30)JOHN W. TAYLOR
Gemistus Pletho as a Moral Philosopher (read by title, p. 84)JOINT SESSION WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
INSTITUTE, 8 O'CLOCK P.M.EDWARD KENNARD RAND
Prudentius and Christian Humanism (p. 71)JOHN O. LOFBERG
Trial by Jury in Athens and America ¹¹ To be published in the *Classical Journal*.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30

THIRD SESSION, 9.30 O'CLOCK A.M.

B. L. ULLMAN

An Unrecognized Description of Caesar's Funeral: Lucan viii,
729-735 ¹

LILY R. TAYLOR

The Cult of Augustus in Italy during his Lifetime (p. 116)

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD

On the Language of the Hittites

EVAN T. SAGE

Ciceronian Afterthoughts ²

LA RUE VAN HOOK

The Exposure of Infants at Athens (p. 134)

EUGENE TAVENNER

The Amulet in Roman Curative Medicine (p. xviii)

GEORGE D. HADZSITS

Greek and Roman Theories Regarding the Origin of Religion
(read by title)

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

Note on *Iliad*, II, 297-302 (read by title, p. xiii)

HAROLD W. GILMER

Prohibitions in the Vulgate New Testament (read by title)

S. GRANT OLIPHANT

Τὸ πρόβατον — Why so called (read by title)

R. B. STEELE

The Ablative of the Efficient (read by title)

¹ Published in the *Classical Quarterly*, xv, 75-77.

² Published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xli, 195-209.

³ To be published in the *Classical Journal*.

FOURTH SESSION, 2.30 O'CLOCK P.M.

L. J. PAETOW

The Revival of Latin as an International Language (p. xvii)

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

Bellerophon's Tablets and the Homeric Question in the Light of
Oriental Research (p. 56)

WILFRED P. MUSTARD

Petrarch's *Africa*¹

GORDON J. LAING

The Cult of the Lares²

ELLA BOURNE

The Classical Elements in the *Gesta Romanorum* (read by title)³

ROBERT B. ENGLISH

A Study of Certain Verse-Endings in Lucretius (read by title)

CHARLES C. MIEROW

Some Random Notes on Horace (read by title, p. xvi)

HENRY S. GEHMAN

A Translation of the *Peta Vatthu*, I-II (read by title)⁴¹ Published in the *American Journal of Philology*, XLII, 97-121.² Published in *Classical Philology*, XVI, 124-140.³ To be published in a proposed volume of Mediaeval Studies by the Faculty
of Vassar College.⁴ To be published in the *Reformed Church Review*.

II. MINUTES

BALTIMORE, MD.

FIRST SESSION

Tuesday afternoon, December 28, 1920.

The Fifty-second Annual Meeting was called to order by the President of the Association, Professor Clifford Herschel Moore, of Harvard University, in 110 Mechanical Engineering Building, Johns Hopkins University. The session was attended by about 80 people.

The Secretary, Professor Clarence P. Bill, of Western Reserve University, reported as follows:

In accordance with action taken by the Association at its last meeting, the Executive Committee has appointed an Endowment Committee, consisting of the following members: Fairfax Harrison (Chairman), Charles E. Bennett, Clarence P. Bill (Secretary), Arthur Fairbanks, Basil L. Gildersleeve, George L. Hendrickson, Maurice Hutton, John M. Manly, Clifford H. Moore, Frank G. Moore, Paul Elmer More, George A. Plimpton (Treasurer), John C. Rolfe, Paul Shorey, Herbert Weir Smyth. Plans for the actual solicitation of funds have been made but not yet put into operation. The Committee proposes to raise an Endowment Fund of \$25,000.00.

As directed by the Association, the Secretary has undertaken the publication of the *Transactions and Proceedings*. The stock of back volumes, which could not be stored by the printer on any reasonable terms, was reduced by the Executive Committee through the sale of superfluous copies, and was transferred to Cleveland, where it is now stored in the Library of Adelbert College of Western Reserve University.

The publication of *Transactions and Proceedings*, Volume 50, was delayed until October 15 by a printers' strike.

The Association now has 656 members, distributed as follows:

Regular annual members	573
From the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	56
Life members	11
Relieved from payment of dues because of age and length of membership	16
	<hr/>
	656

The membership record for the past year is as follows:

New members	78
Reinstated	12
Gain in members from the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast	6
	<hr/>
Total gain	96

Members lost	
By death	16
By resignation	8
Dropped for failure in payment of dues	15
<hr/>	
Total loss	39
Total net gain	57

The new members elected by the Executive Committee during the year are as follows :

Dr. Louise E. W. Adams, Smith College.
Harold D. Allen, William Penn Charter School.
Dr. May A. Allen, University of Chattanooga.
Dr. Anne C. E. Allinson, Providence, R. I.
Dr. Lawrence H. Baker, Johns Hopkins University.
Alfred R. Bellinger, Yale University.
M. Julia Bentley, Cincinnati, O.
John D. Bickford, Culver Military Academy.
Dr. Carl W. Blegen, American School of Classical Studies, Athens.
Prof. A. E. R. Boak, University of Michigan.
Charles A. Boyer, Raleigh, N. C.
George S. Brett, University of Toronto.
Frank Brewster, Boston, Mass.
Harry Caplan, Cornell University.
Prof. W. L. Carr, Oberlin College.
Prof. Jane G. Carter, Hunter College.
Arnold B. Chace, Providence, R. I.
Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard Law School.
Helen M. Chesnutt, Cleveland, O.
Edward C. Chickering, New York City.
Prof. Frederick W. Clark, University of Manitoba
Prof. Herman A. Clark, University of Oregon.
Dr. Harrison C. Coffin, Union College.
Prof. Albert R. Crittenden, University of Michigan.
Prof. John N. Daland, Milton College, Milton, Wis.
Mildred Dean, Washington, D. C.
Dr. E. B. De Sauzé, Cleveland, O.
Prof. James C. Dolley, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill.
Dr. Lulu G. Eldridge, Cleveland, O.
Judge L. A. Emery, Providence, R. I.
Elizabeth Faulkner, Chicago, Ill.
Judge John M. Gest, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. A. F. Geyser, Campion College.
Theodore F. Green, Providence, R. I.
Dr. H. M. Hays, Chicago, Ill.
Prof. Victor D. Hill, Ohio University.

Prof. Robert H. Hiller, Wittenberg College.
Prof. Harriet D. Johnson, Denison University.
Prof. R. O. Jolliffe, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.
Harriet R. Kirby, Columbus, O.
Prof. Robert C. Kissling, Carroll College.
Prof. James A. Kleist, St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, O.
Prof. Fred A. Knapp, Bates College.
Prof. Helen H. Law, Meredith College.
Lotta B. Liebmann, Cleveland, O.
Daniel W. Lothman, Cleveland, O.
Elford F. Lounsbury, Tilton, N. H.
Katharine Lummis, Sweet Briar College.
Dr. Eugene S. McCartney, Northwestern University.
Prof. Joseph S. Magnuson, State University of Iowa.
C. A. Maury, Seattle, Wash.
Dr. Henrietta J. Meeteer, Swarthmore College.
Prof. Frank J. Miller, University of Chicago.
Prof. Paul G. Moorhead, Juniata College.
Dr. Clyde Murley, Northwestern University.
Prof. John S. Murray, Furman University.
George W. Pepper, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. Ben E. Perry, Dartmouth College.
Prof. Chandler R. Post, Harvard University.
Dr. Rodney P. Robinson, University of Cincinnati.
Mabel V. Root, Catskill, N. Y.
Ruskin R. Rosborough, University of Pennsylvania.
Prof. William T. Rowland, Amherst College.
Prof. P. W. Russell, Biddle University.
Prof. Frances E. Sabin, University of Wisconsin.
Prof. S. B. Slack, McGill University.
Dr. R. Morris Smith, Wittenberg University.
Mrs. Anne B. B. Sturgis, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Prof. Archer Taylor, Washington University.
Boyce A. Thomas, William Penn Charter School.
Prof. Clara L. Thompson, Shorter College.
Margaret Titchener, Vassar College.
Prof. Catherine Torrance, Agnes Scott College.
Prof. Justin L. Van Gundy, Monmouth College.
Philip B. Whitehead, Yale University.
Dr. Alfred R. Wightman, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H.
Prof. W. D. Woodhead, University of Toronto.
Dr. Charles H. Zimmerman, New Haven, Conn.

The following report of the Treasurer was then read :

RECEIPTS

Balance, December 18, 1919		\$1290.97
Sales of <i>Transactions</i> and reprints	\$450.62	
Membership dues, annual	1727.14	
Membership dues, life	150.00	
Initiation fees	360.00	
Interest	70.30	
Dividends	6.00	
Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, membership fees	160.00	
Sale of Anglo-French 5% bond, representing investment of two life-membership fees	99.56	
James Loeb, contribution	100.00	
Total receipts to December 15, 1920		<u>3123.62</u>
		\$4414.59

EXPENDITURES

<i>Transactions and Proceedings</i> (Vol. L)	\$2335.80	
Salary of Secretary and Treasurer	350.00	
Printing and stationery	235.76	
Postage	88.43	
Express, freight, and cartage	25.92	
Telegrams	3.21	
Index to <i>Transactions and Proceedings</i> , XLI-L	75.00	
Liberty bonds (4th 4½), investment of three life-membership fees	130.97	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland 5½% bond, reinvestment of two life-membership fees	87.79	
Contribution to American Council of Learned Societies	29.95	
Expenses of delegate to American Council of Learned Societies	9.91	
Guest tickets to dinner at Semi-Centennial Meeting	5.00	
Total expenditures to December 15, 1920		\$3377.74
Balance, December 15, 1920		<u>1036.85</u>
		\$4414.59

The Chair announced the appointment of the usual committees, as follows :

To Audit the Treasurer's Accounts: Professors B. L. Ullman and W. S. Messer.

On the Place of the Next Meeting: Professors F. G. Allinson, G. J. Laing, and D. R. Stuart.

On Resolutions: Professors G. L. Hendrickson and H. E. Burton, and Miss Mary H. Buckingham.

The remainder of the session was devoted to the reading of papers.

JOINT SESSION WITH THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

Tuesday evening, December 28.

The societies met at 8 P.M. in 120 Civil Engineering Building, Johns Hopkins University, Professor James C. Egbert, President of the Institute, presiding. About 120 people were present.

Mr. R. Brent Keyser, President of the Board of Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University, welcomed the societies, and Professor Theodore A. Miller responded.

The President of the Association, Professor Clifford Herschel Moore, delivered the Annual Address, the subject being *Prophecy in the Epic*.

SECOND SESSION

Wednesday morning, December 28.

The Association was called to order by the President at 9.30 o'clock in 110 Mechanical Engineering Building. The entire session was devoted to the reading of papers. About 70 people were present.

SECOND JOINT SESSION WITH THE INSTITUTE

Wednesday evening, December 29.

The societies met in 120 Engineering Building, the President of the Association presiding. The session was devoted to the reading of papers. About 100 people were present.

THIRD SESSION

Thursday morning, December 30.

The Association was called to order by the President at 9.30 o'clock in 110 Mechanical Engineering Building. The session was entirely devoted to the reading of papers, and was attended by about 90 people.

FOURTH SESSION

Thursday afternoon, December 30.

The business meeting of the Association was called to order by the President at 2.30 o'clock in 110 Mechanical Engineering Building. About 65 members attended.

The Committee to Audit the Treasurer's Accounts reported as follows:

We have examined the above accounts and vouchers and find them to correspond. In all respects we find the record to be correct.

December 29, 1920.

(Signed) B. L. Ullman

Wm. Stuart Messer } *Auditors.*

The report of the committee was adopted and placed on file.

The Committee on the Place of the Next Meeting, through its Chairman, Professor Allinson, recommended that the next meeting be held at the University of Michigan in December, 1921, in conjunction with the Archaeological Institute of America. The recommendation was adopted.

The following resolutions, reported by the Committee on Resolutions, were read by the Secretary, in the absence of the Committee, and were adopted:

Resolved, That the members of the American Philological Association, assembled for the Fifty-second Annual Meeting, desire to thank the President and the Board of Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University for their cordial interest in the meeting and for placing at the disposal of the Association the rooms of the University for its committees and for its public meetings.

To Professor David M. Robinson and his associates upon the Local Committee they feel under very special obligations for the thoughtful care with which they have provided for the comfort and pleasure of every one. To Mrs. Robinson they would express their peculiar gratitude for her generous hospitality, which has combined happily social entertainment with the business affairs of the Association and its committees.

They would convey their thanks also to Mr. Henry Walters and to Dr. and Mrs. Henry Barton Jacobs for their generosity in making accessible the treasures of their art collections, and they would express to Mr. William Gates and to the Maya Society their appreciation of the hospitable entertainment offered to the Association.

To the officers of the Johns Hopkins Club finally they are indebted for courtesies which have done much to give a common center and meeting-place to the members of the Association for refreshment and for friendly meeting.

The Association's Representatives on the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, in a letter from their Chairman

Professor John C. Kirtland, reported that difficulties caused by the war were still preventing the completion of the Committee's final report. The report of the Association's Representatives was adopted and the representation continued.

The report of the Committee on International Meetings, presented, in the absence of the Chairman, by Professor E. K. Rand, consisted of the following resolutions :

That the Association gladly accept the courteous invitation of the Classical Association of Great Britain to the Anglo-American General Meeting of that Association, to be held in August, 1921, this resolution to be transmitted at once to the Secretary of the Classical Association of Great Britain.

That the Secretary issue printed notice of the meeting to the members of the Association as soon as complete information is furnished by the Secretary of the Classical Association of Great Britain.

That members of the Association intending to attend the meeting notify the Secretary, submitting for the decision of the Executive Committee, in the usual way, the titles and outlines of papers they wish to read.

That the Secretary communicate to the Secretary of the Classical Association of Great Britain the titles of accepted papers and an estimate of the number intending to be present.

These resolutions were adopted and the Committee continued.

The Secretary of the Endowment Committee, Professor C. P. Bill, reported the plans of the Committee for the raising of the Endowment Fund, including the division of the Association's territory into districts, each with an assigned quota and with a Subcommittee in charge of the actual solicitation of subscriptions. The report was accepted.

The Nominating Committee, in a letter from its Chairman, Professor Edward P. Morris, reported as follows :

President, Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania.

Vice-Presidents, Professor Francis Greenleaf Allinson, Brown University.

Professor Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University.

Secretary and Treasurer, Professor Clarence P. Bill, Western Reserve University.

Executive Committee, The above-named officers, and Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont.

Dr. Richard Mott Gummere, William Penn Charter School.

Principal Maurice Hutton, University College, Toronto.

Professor Gordon Jennings Laing, University of Chicago.

Professor Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University.

The Secretary was instructed to cast the ballot of the Association for the election of these officers.

The President announced the appointment of Professor Edward Capps as a member of the Nominating Committee for one year, in place of Professor E. P. Morris, resigned, and the appointment of Professor Frank Frost Abbott as a member of the same committee for five years.

The Executive Committee proposed amendments to the Constitution (Article IV, Sections 2 and 3) increasing the annual fee to five dollars and the life-membership fee to seventy-five dollars, with the hope, however, that the need of these amendments might be obviated, before the next meeting, by the success of the endowment campaign. It was voted to receive the amendments.

On recommendation of the Executive Committee the following measures were taken :

Voted, That the statement of next year's annual dues contain a request for a voluntary contribution of not less than one dollar from each member in addition to the usual fee, in order to enable the Association to meet pressing financial needs.

Voted, That the delegates of the Association to the American Council of Learned Societies, and its representative on the Executive Committee of the American Classical League, be hereafter elected by the Association on recommendation of the Nominating Committee.

On motion of Professor D. P. Lockwood it was

Voted, That a committee of seven be appointed to coöperate with the American Committee on International Languages, without authority to commit the Association to any policy in the matter.

It was also

Voted, That the Chair be authorized to include Professor L. J. Paetow among the members of the Committee.

The Chair then appointed the following members: Professors W. A. Oldfather (Chairman), C. D. Buck, R. G. Kent, D. P. Lockwood, C. W. Mendell, H. C. Nutting, L. J. Paetow.

On motion of Professor K. P. Harrington it was

Voted, That the Executive Committee be requested to endeavor, in conference with the corresponding committee of the Archaeological Institute, to arrange a larger number of joint sessions, and that if possible the other sessions of the two associations be held alternately or at different hours.

The remainder of the session was devoted to the reading of papers.

The total number of members present at the meeting was 115.

III. ABSTRACTS

1. *Note on Π 297-302*, by Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont.

Studies in the technique and function of the Homeric similes have convinced the writer that Eustathius was near the truth in holding that the simile is not "glued to the narrative"; that the poet expanded the picture "to please himself," and that the added details are to be disregarded in applying the comparison. Occasionally the elaboration of the picture suggests a new point of contact, and there is always the possibility of overtones; but the point of resemblance is regularly made clear by a verbal repetition in the apodosis beginning with *ὥς*, etc. Moreover, this repetition, which marks the similarity, is sometimes made by a participle, the main verb of the apodosis being used to carry on the narrative: E 142 f., *ἐμμεμαώς . . . ὥς μεμαώς*; N 200 f., *ὑψοῦ . . . ἔχοντε . . . ὥς ὑψοῦ ἔχοντε*. Hence the application of the simile in Π 297-302 is neither the one usually given (the coming of Patroclus is a light of safety) nor that of Professor Mackail (the likeness is between the brief respite of the Greeks and the momentary illumination given by a flash of lightning, *Lectures on Greek Poetry*, 76). These ideas may be present as overtones in the passage, but the simile *as a comparison* depends upon the likeness between the quenching of the fire and the consequent removal of the smoke from the ship of Protesilaus, and the vanishing of a cloud from a mountain peak, which in turn suggests to the poet the splendid picture described in vss. 299 f. The verbal repetition in the apodosis makes this clear:

*ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀφ' ὑψηλῆς κορυφῆς ὄρεος μεγάλοιο
κινήσῃ πυκινὴν νεφέλην,
.
ὅς Δαναοὶ νηῶν μὲν ἀπωσάμενοι δῆιον πῦρ.*

The establishment of this interpretation must await the publication of the studies referred to above.

2. *Acharnians*, 803, by Professor H. Lamar Crosby, University of Pennsylvania.

None of the manuscripts of the *Acharnians* yields a readable version of line 803. That of Pal. 67 alone is metrically acceptable. With variations as noted, the line is preserved as follows: τί δαὶ σύκα (σῦκα) τρώγοις ἄν αὐτὸς (αὐτὸς ἄν); κοῖ κοῖ (κοῖ). In one late manuscript we find τί δαὶ σὺ κατατρώγοις.

The practice of most modern editors has been either to omit the line or to adopt Elmsley's version:

ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σύ; τρώγοις ἄν; ΚΟ. κοῖ κοῖ κοῖ.

The line cannot be discarded, in spite of the fact that Suidas cites lines 802 and 804 together, omitting 803. For a papyrus fragment of about the fifth century proves 803 to be much earlier than Suidas; and κεκράγατε (804) has no justification without 803.

The false accent (σύκα) recorded in most manuscripts lends color to the belief that σὺ may originally have stood in the line. But can we be sure that Elmsley was right in dropping σῦκα? And how shall we regard his omission of αὐτός, which is found in all manuscripts?

I venture, therefore, to propose a new reading:

ΔΙ. τί δαὶ σύ; ΜΕ. σῦκά γ' αὐτὸς ἄν. ΚΟ. κοῖ κοῖ.

It seems far easier to trace the intrusion of τρώγοις to its occurrence in 801 and to the idea of eating which pervades the passage than to believe that αὐτός is a false reading for αὐτάς or αἶας, a gloss on ἰσχάδας. I have assigned the words σῦκά γ' αὐτὸς ἄν to the Megarian. He had shown no emotion at the mention of chickpeas, but he pricks up his ears at the word ἰσχάδας. Though doubtless ordinarily no delicacy, the latter may have gained in favor during the war (*Vesp.* 297), and that the Megarian was interested is attested by 809-810. It may well be that both in 803 and in 809-810 he speaks 'aside.'

3. *The Roman Poet Laureate*, by Professor Karl P. Harrington, Wesleyan University.

Though the formal office of poet laureate was established only about three hundred years ago, by an English monarch, the idea is in practice as old as all great literature. In Rome we may trace it from the beginning of the Empire to its end, with here and there an apparent *lacuna*. The temper of a Catullus, with his out-

spoken defiance of the great men of his time, contrasts in a very enlightening manner with that of the Augustan poets, with their growing appreciation, and ultimately flattery, of their chief. Vergil in the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* already acknowledges the "divus" quality of Augustus and even of Julius, and in the *Aeneid* deliberately glorifies the new imperial line. It did not take Horace long after his return in despair from Philippi to recognize the inevitable in Roman politics and ally himself definitely with the power that was and was to be. Nearly one half of his lyric product owes its origin to the spell cast over him by the greatness of his imperial patron. We can trace the increase of adulation in Lucan's rhetoric and Statius' preposterous flattery, as well as in various minor figures in the field of poetry. With Statius indeed no travesty of truth is too violent, no address to his divine worship the emperor too absurd. Ausonius the nominal Christian could liken the emperor to the trinitarian Godhead; and Claudian, a real poetic genius of boundless possibilities, only frittered away his splendid talents in such themes as the laudation and defence of Honorius and Stilicho. Sidonius Apollinaris and Priscian but continue the tradition. So Roman poetry, fostered by the first great emperor, found itself ere long in a thralldom in which it sank deeper and deeper, till the Empire died and a new inspiration came from the new faith that was transforming civilization.'

4. *Homer, Vergil, and Milton in Their Use of Images from Nature*, by Professor Arthur L. Keith, Carleton College.

An examination of the attitude of the three great epic poets toward nature as shown by their images offers some interesting results. Homer, standing at the dawn of civilization, has not progressed far from that close intimacy with nature possessed by primitive and untutored peoples. His images seem to come from intimate, personal experiences and show nature from close range and in intense action. They show keen observation and indicate that the poet accepted nature in all her aspects with the utmost eagerness.

Vergil does not manifest that immediate intimacy with nature which marks the Homeric poems. There is indeed an interest in nature, but it is of a more remote sort. While Homer takes nature to his embrace, Vergil seems to enjoy her at a respectful distance.

Vergil prefers nature in her tranquil moods and usually places the point of the comparison on the static rather than the dramatic. He lacks Homer's keenness of perception, his similes being of a more general form. This difference between the imagery of the two poets is partly due to their varying points of view. Homer seems to write of his own experiences while Vergil writes of events in the distant past.

Milton resembles Vergil more closely than he does Homer. He likewise takes a point of view far removed from his own experiences. Nature is subordinated to his purpose "to justify the ways of God to man." There is a larger contemplative element in his images than in those of his predecessors. Notwithstanding his limitations, many of his images are painted in colors too glowing to permit any doubt of his love for the nature they represented. This spontaneous feeling was given an unfortunate bias by his puritanical training. His attitude toward nature, as indicated by his imagery, is curiously composite.

5. *Some Random Notes on Horace*, by Professor Charles Christopher Mierow, Colorado College.

After some introductory remarks on the appeal which the *Odes* of Horace inevitably make to the average college freshman, and a discussion of the best method of teaching the varied content of a course that undertakes to do justice to the Venusian bard, this paper considers somewhat at length the question of the subject matter of the *Odes*. A preliminary classification of the poems (I) under their general themes is followed (II) by a grouping in accordance with the names of the persons to whom they are dedicated. Yet another basis for classification (III) is afforded by a consideration of the origin of the separate poems: whether they are spontaneous or 'made to order.' Next (IV) an attempt is made to separate the serious poems from those in lighter vein, subdividing each group into its natural and appropriate subheads. The love poems are given separate treatment in a section (V) in which an endeavor is made to sift the false from the true — the poems of real passion from the far more numerous graceful but unconvincing imitations, and in conclusion (VI) the subject of each ode is expressed in the form of a 'text' taken from the poem itself.

6. *The Revival of Latin as an International Language*, by Professor L. J. Paetow, University of California.

Twice in the history of the world the Latin language functioned as an international language: in the ancient Roman Empire and in western Europe during the Middle Ages. Recently desultory attempts have been made to supply the world with this lost tool by inventing a universal language. Organized scholarship should now address itself to this problem and urge that Latin be revived as the international language of the modern world. Latin died because the mediaeval universities neglected the systematic study of language and literature and because the Italian humanists set up an impossible ideal, namely, to make classical Latin the universal medium of intercourse. Men found that too difficult and accepted the various vernaculars of Europe as substitutes for Latin. We should now study the whole history of Latin sympathetically, mediaeval and modern Latin as well as classical Latin. Du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*, should be made the basis of a modern dictionary of postclassical Latin which has been a *desideratum* for centuries. This would enable us to lay firm and sure foundations for a Latin grammar and orthography which would present a simple and effective form of Latin, suitable for practical daily use and for international intercourse. This form of Latin should be introduced frankly as an auxiliary language, but it should be of such a nature that future generations could make it a universal language, even a substitute for their national languages, if they so desired. In order to investigate the details of this problem a committee should be appointed by the American Philological Association.

7. *The Idea of Law in Greek Poetry*, by Professor Henry S. Scribner, University of Pittsburgh.

The mental characteristics of the Greeks — clearness, and a love of beauty and measure — are seen in the structure of their language, and in their literature, philosophy, and art. Their speculations on nature, mind, and social institutions tended to establish the reign of law.

In their poetry the idea of the control of law in character and conduct is prominent. In Homer we see those peculiar character-

istics of the Greek race — temperance, self-knowledge, the feeling of man's limitations, and the habit of looking within the heart in times of temptation and danger. *Sophrosyne* directed the form of Homer's poetry.

The Dorians had an innate respect for law. At Sparta, though excessive physical and military training discouraged individuality and mental culture, the reign of law, the habit of acting together in gymnastics and in the service of religion and the state, produced the choral lyric. Rhythmic laws of motion helped to interpret the social mind.

The directing law of Aeolian lyric is the close union of poetry and music, of sound and emotion, of thought and form. Here Sappho was supreme. The versatility and reflective spirit of Ionia expressed itself in elegiac and iambic verse, the former the vehicle of meditation and mourning, the latter adapted to satire and moralizing on human life.

At Athens poetry and the fine arts were brought to perfection only as they obeyed those laws implicit in the Greek mind — clearness, symmetry, proportion, and balance of parts. Through them the lofty patriotic and moral ideals of Sophocles and Phidias found adequate expression.

When Greek poetry lost touch with life and no longer expressed the mind of the people, it waned. Universal truths, embodied afresh in the thought of each generation, must be expressed in accordance with the true laws of literary art before they can become a part of the world's greatest literature.

8. *The Amulet in Roman Curative Medicine*, by Professor Eugene Tavenner, Washington University.

Though amulets are usually prophylactic in character, Roman authors frequently speak of substances that were used exactly as prophylactic amulets, except that they were applied for the purpose of curing rather than preventing disease. We may therefore consider as a curative amulet any substance that was hung around, placed near, or otherwise applied to the body of a sick person for the purpose of effecting a cure, wherever it is clear that the substance so placed was not a medicament.

That the Roman populace used amulets to cure almost every

physical ailment is shown by detailed citations from authors ranging chronologically from Scribonius Largus to Marcellus Empiricus. Such amulets were made of animal, vegetable, and mineral substances. The smaller animals were used whole, while of the larger animals that part was generally used which corresponded to the diseased part of the patient. The amulets were worn in most cases suspended at the neck of the patient, though some were attached to the arm, and still others near the diseased part.

The following general conclusions are reached: (1) That the curative amulet was not in general use among the Romans before 50 A.D.; (2) that it was probably imported from the Orient; (3) that its use spread rapidly throughout Italy and the provinces; and (4) that the popular attribution of curative force was based largely on *sympathia*.

PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

I. PROGRAMME

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26

FIRST SESSION, 10 O'CLOCK A.M.

OLIVER M. JOHNSTON
The First Canto of Dante's *Divine Comedy*

ARTHUR P. MCKINLAY
The Art of Boethius' *Consolatio Philosophiae*

HAROLD L. BRUCE
The Contemporary Biographers of William Blake

FRANK H. REINSCH
Goethe's Interest in Practical Politics and Diplomacy, 1777-1787

ALWIN THALER
Box-Office and Repertory in Shakespeare's Theatre

SECOND SESSION, 2 O'CLOCK P.M.

WILLIAM L. SCHWARTZ
The Influence of 'Japonisme' upon Modern French Literature

ROBERT W. GORDON
Ballad Imitations

H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH
Montenegro under the Romans (p. xxv)

ROBERT P. UTTER
What Shall We Say about Slang?

GEORGE M. CALHOUN

The Punishment of Homicide in Ancient Greece ¹

CLAIR HADYN BELL

The Call of the Blood in the Mediaeval German Epic

THIRD SESSION, 8 O'CLOCK P.M.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK

Mediaeval Romanticism and Rationalism :
Annual Address of the President of the Association

GEORGE HEMPL

The Prehistoric Wanderings of the Hittite Greeks

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27

FOURTH SESSION, 9.45 O'CLOCK A.M.

WILLIAM J. WILSON

The Literary Analysis of the Book of Acts (p. xxvi)

ARTHUR G. BRODEUR

Androcles and the Lion

FRANKLIN SCHNEIDER

Bécquer's *Rimas* and Heine's *Lieder*

MAX RADIN

Partes Secanto in the XII Tables (p. xxv)

BENJAMIN H. LEHMAN

The Influence of Carlyle's Theory of the Hero upon Carlyle's
Writings

ALLISON GAW

The Date of *1 Henry VI*

¹ To be published as part of a larger study.

II. MINUTES

The Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast was held in San Francisco, November 26 and 27, 1920, the morning and afternoon sessions at the Hotel Plaza, and the evening session at the University Club, immediately after the annual dinner. On account of illness, the President, Professor J. S. P. Tatlock, of the Leland Stanford Junior University, was unable to attend any of the sessions. In his absence Professor W. A. Cooper, of the Leland Stanford Junior University, presided at the first and third sessions, and Professor M. E. Deutsch, of the University of California, at the second and fourth. President Tatlock's address was read by Professor W. D. Briggs. The following items of business were transacted:

The Treasurer submitted the following report for 1919-1920:

RECEIPTS	
Balance on hand, Nov. 28, 1919	\$243.36
Dues	428.50
Interest	8.65
Refunds from Modern Language Association	<u>5.50</u>
	\$686.01
EXPENDITURES	
Dues to American Philological Association	\$160.00
Dues to Modern Language Association	180.00
Printing, postage, stationery, etc.	64.47
St. Francis Hotel (rooms for 1919 meeting)	10.00
Waiters' gratuity (1919 meeting)	5.00
B. F. White (stereopticon and services, 1919 meeting)	4.00
Balance on hand, Nov. 26, 1920	<u>262.54</u>
	\$686.01

On motion the report was accepted and referred to the Auditing Committee.

Vice-President Cooper appointed the following committees:

Nominations: Professors Johnston, Linforth, Elmore.

Auditing: Professors Paschall, C. G. Allen, Mr. Schwartz.

Social: Professors J. T. Allen, Fairclough, Noyes.

The Secretary gave the statistics of membership for the past year, and announced that the Modern Language Association of

America, at its March meeting, had voted to ratify the agreement already provisionally in force with the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, the Secretary proposed an amendment to the Constitution, namely, that Article iv ("Members") be amended by adding a new section, to read as follows:

§ 3. If at any future time either the American Philological Association or the Modern Language Association of America shall, for sufficient reasons, increase or diminish the sum of Two Dollars and Fifty Cents (\$2.50) now required from the Treasurer of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast to pay for an annual membership in the national organization in question, the Executive Committee shall be empowered, at its discretion, to increase or diminish the annual dues of those members whose membership includes membership in the national organization in question.

As the foregoing amendment could not be immediately adopted, the Secretary reported a recommendation of the Executive Committee to the effect that, pending the adoption of the proposed amendment to the Constitution, the Executive Committee be empowered, for the year 1921, to increase the dues of those members whose membership includes membership in the Modern Language Association of America, by the amount necessary to meet the increased demands which may be made upon our Treasurer by the Modern Language Association.

On motion the report of the Secretary was accepted and the recommendation of the Executive Committee adopted.

The Nominating Committee proposed the following officers for the ensuing year:

President: W. A. Cooper.

Vice-Presidents: M. E. Deutsch, C. G. Allen.

Secretary: P. B. Fay, during such time as he may be in residence, to be succeeded by S. G. Morley.

Executive Committee: The above-named officers, and B. O. Foster, A. P. McKinlay, R. Schevill, E. A. Wicher.

On motion the report of the committee was adopted and these officers were declared elected.

On motion it was voted that the Association express to Professor Tatlock its sympathy and its regret at his inability to be present, and thank him for his very interesting address.

The Auditing Committee reported that the accounts and vouchers of the Treasurer were correct and in order.

On motion, a vote of thanks for hospitality was extended to the Manager of the Hotel Plaza and to the Directors of the University Club, and the Treasurer was instructed to contribute from the funds of the Association the sum of five dollars to the ' Christmas Box ' for the waiters at the University Club.

The attendance at the four sessions numbered 43, 52, 28, and 36, respectively.

Thirty-one new members were elected.

III. ABSTRACTS

1. *Montenegro under the Romans, and the Question of Diocletian's Birthplace*, by Professor H. Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Junior University.

The Montenegro of today once formed part of the district of Praevalitana, comprised in the Roman province of Illyricum, which was first created in the time of Augustus in 9 A.D.

The writer, who has recently returned to America after serving for eighteen months in Montenegro as Commissioner of the American Red Cross, gives an account of the roads which the Romans built in that mountainous region, and refers to other indications of Roman occupation. The chief Roman remains are to be found at Dukle, the site of the ancient Doclea, which lies at the junction of the Zeta and Morača rivers. This town is not mentioned in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* or in the *Itineraria Antonini*, and is seldom referred to in our literary records. These remains include a large portion of the city wall, the forum, a basilica, two temples, *thermae*, and a portico. Numerous coins and intaglios have been found on the site. About seventy inscriptions have been discovered here, only one of which is in Greek. The names Flavius and Flavia are common and indicate a connection with the Flavian emperors.

The paper discusses the common belief that Doclea was the birthplace of Diocletian, and finds that belief erroneous. Salonae is shown to be the Emperor's probable birthplace, and the origin of the prevalent error is traced to a confusion found in a passage of the *Épitome* of Aurelius Victor.

2. *Partes Secanto in the XII Tables*, by Professor Max Radin, University of California.

The phrase *partes secanto* in the XII Tables has been taken to mean that the creditors of an insolvent debtor might cut his body into parts proportionate to their claims. This interpretation is as old as Quintilian. Its weakness lies in its variance with Roman practice and feeling, and in the silence of Livy and Cicero, as well as of all other writers before Quintilian. It has found favor be-

cause the only alternative which has been proposed is that the words refer to execution against the debtor's property. That is legally untenable, although talion of goods is known in primitive society. Here, however, execution against the person is obviously meant.

The purpose of the paper is to suggest that *bonorum sectio* in its technical sense is meant. That suggestion has been made before, but the precise details of the process have not been noticed. The addict lost his civil personality (*caput*), his goods were confiscated and sold by the *sectores*. The latter do not buy the goods but the right to sell them. They are quasi-public officers. They have no title, but can transfer title. In doing so, they speculate in the price. They owe the state the amount bid, whether or not the retail price — which in form is paid to the state — actually equals the bid or not. They are also entitled to any excess. That is the meaning of *si plus minusve secuerint, se fraude esto*.

3. *The Literary Analysis of the Book of Acts*, by Professor William J. Wilson, Hitchcock Military Academy.

The twofold division of Acts was asserted by Harnack on literary grounds alone, but Torrey's *Composition and Date of Acts* has fairly demonstrated an Aramaic original for I, 1 b-15, 35, the remainder being a Greek continuation by the translator of the earlier history, presumably Luke. Any further analysis into sources Torrey has adjudged impossible. Regarding II Acts (15, 36-28, 31) this position seems correct. A simple, straightforward narrative based apparently on contemporary sources of information, it shows no tendency or bias beyond a certain complacency of the Gentiles in appropriating Christianity and in neglecting its Jewish heritage. I Acts, on the other hand, is a skilful work of art, resting on sound historical foundations, especially toward its close, but so designed as to support a particular doctrinal position. Its principal thesis is that admission to Christianity should be free to Gentiles and Jews without discrimination, because the "speaking with tongues" which regularly accompanied the initiatory rite of baptism, and which was viewed as a divinely imparted sign of the candidate's acceptability, was a gift enjoyed as readily by converts from Hellenism as by converts from Judaism. To support this view the

story of Pentecost has been redacted by the addition of 2, 5-11 (12?) and of ἐτέρας in 2, 4, while the narrative of the ascension has been made a virtual literary preface. The vague general descriptions in 2, 43-47; 4, 32-35; 5, 12-16 are also ascribable to the final author, who probably composed from personal knowledge or oral sources chapters 13-15 and most of 6, 1-8; 8, 1 b-8; 8, 25; 9, 19 b-31; 9, 35; (11, 16 f.); 11, 19-30; 12, 24 f. The intervening concrete narratives fall out as presumptive written sources. The preëminence here of Peter and the special references to Mark suggest a possible connection with the Petrine *memorabilia* which Papias mentions as the basis of the Markan Gospel.

INDEX

Arabic numerals refer to pages of the *Transactions*, Roman to the *Proceedings*.

- Abiogenesis: 101 ff.
 Accents: v. Latin verse.
 Acts, Book of, literary analysis: xxvi.
Aetna, the, a work of Ovid: 163.
 Ambrose, his hymns compared with those of Prudentius: 76 ff.
 Amulet, the, in Roman curative medicine: xviii f.
ἀνδρεία: 89.
 Aristophanes, *Ach.* 803, critical note on: xiii f.
 Aristotle, on exposure of infants: 142 f.
Armament of Igor, the: 44 f.
 Artemis: 40 ff.
 Artemisium, and Thermopylae: 5 ff.
 Athens, exposure of infants at: 134 ff.; v. Exposure.
 Augustus, worship of, in Italy during his lifetime: 116 ff.; in the Orient: 116; in Rome: *ib.*; places in Italy where the worship existed: 117 ff.; earliest dated evidence for the worship: 117 f.; sacerdos Augusti: 121, 123; flamen Augustalis: *ib.*; worship of later living emperors: 121 ff.; really the worship of the emperor's genius: 123 ff.; the genius and Mars Ultor: 125 ff.; the genius in the forum of Pompeii: 128 ff.; genius of the emperor's heir: 130 f.; introduction and development of the cult of the genius: 131 f.; its independence in the municipalities: 133.
 Avdotya, in the bylina of Ivan Godinovich: 40 f.
 Bellerophon's tablet and the Homeric question in the light of oriental research: 56 ff.; *σήματα λυγρά* as interpreted by ancient commentators: 57 ff.; writing in Homer's time: 59 ff.; the *πλινὰξ πτυκτός* a clay tablet: 62 ff.; extant inscriptions no test of the antiquity of writing: 67 ff.; Homer's sources: 69.
 Byliny, the Russian: v. Tauric Maiden.
 Callias, ὁ λακκόπλουτος: 172 ff.; v. Cratinus.
Catalepton, ix, a work of Ovid: 159.
χρηστότης: 97 f.
 Christian humanism, Prudentius and: 71 ff.
 Christian hymns, conflict of word accent and verse accent in: 26 ff.; hymns by Ambrose and Prudentius, critique of: 76 ff.
χυτρίζειν: 138.
Ciris, the, a work of Ovid: 160 ff.
 Comedy, New, exposure of infants in: 139 ff.
 Cratinus, the Ἀρχιλοχοί of, and Callias ὁ λακκόπλουτος: 172 ff.; date of the Ἀρχιλοχοί: 172 ff., 187; character of Callias: 174 ff.; a new fragment of the Ἀρχιλοχοί and its metrical relations: 182 ff.; Callias' fine of fifty talents: 180 f., 186 f.
Culex, the, a work of Ovid: 163.
 Dactyls and spondees, relative proportion in Ovid, 149 ff.; v. Ovid.
δικαιοσύνη: 94 f.
 Diocletian's birthplace: xxv.
ἐγχυτρισμός: 138.
ἐκτίθημι 'expose': 138 f.
ἐλευθεριότης: 88.
 Emperor, Roman, worship of the: 116 ff.; v. Augustus.
 Ethics: v. Pletho.
εὐβουλία: 99.
εὐψυχία: 90 f.
 Exposure of infants at Athens in *saec.* v-iv B.C.: 134 ff.; prevailing opinions as to its frequency: 134 f.; Athenian fondness for children: 135 f.; more than one son commonly

- raised: 136; girls not frequently exposed: 136 f.; *χυτρίζειν* and *ἐγχυτρισμός*: 138; *ἐκτίθημι* 'expose': 138 f.; *Ion* of Eur.: 139; New Comedy: 139 ff.; social and economic conditions: 141 f.; views of Plato and Aristotle: 142 f.; later increase in exposure: 143 f.; conclusions: 144 f.
- Flamen Augustalis: 121, 123; v. Augustus.
- Gemistus: v. Pletho.
- Genius of the Roman emperor, worship of the: 123 ff.; v. Augustus.
- γενναιότης*: 92 f.
- Helen: 51.
- Herodotus, account of Thermopylae and Artemisium: 5 ff.; v. Thermopylae.
- Homer, *Il.* xvi, 297-302, note on: xiii; point of resemblance in a Homeric simile: *ib.*; H., Vergil, and Milton in their use of images from nature: xv f.
- Homeric question: 56 ff.; v. Bellerophon's tablet.
- Horace, influence on Prudentius: 75 f.; random notes on: xvi; classification of the *Odes*: *ib.*
- Humanism, Christian, Prudentius and: 71 ff.
- Infants: v. Exposure.
- International language: v. Latin.
- Iphigenia: 40 ff.
- κοσμιότης*: 87 f.
- Latin, colloquial: 37; Latin as an international language, revival of: xvii.
- Latin verse, alleged conflict of the accents in: 19 ff.; pitch accent of prose and stress accent of verse: 23 ff.; conflicts of accent in late Latin hymns: 26 ff.
- Law, idea of, in Greek poetry: xvii f.
- Lucretius, influence on Prudentius: 73 ff.
- Mars Ultor: 125 ff., 132.
- Marya, in the bylina of Sweet Mikhailo Ivanovich the Rover: 41 f.
- Medicine: v. Amulet.
- Messalla Collection, Ovidian authorship of the: 153, 157 ff.
- μετρίότης*: 88 f.
- Milton: v. Homer.
- Montenegro under the Romans, and the question of Diocletian's birthplace: xxv.
- Obida, in the *Armament of Igor*: 44 f.
- Oriental research, and the Homeric question: 56 ff.; v. Bellerophon's tablet.
- όσιότης*: 95 f.
- Ovid, juvenile works of, and the spondaic period of his metrical art: 146 ff.; development of his technique: 146 ff., 149 ff.; refinements of his art: 148 ff.; preponderance of dactyls: 149; preponderance of spondees in first edition of *Amores*: 150 f., 166 f., 169 f.; its revision: 167 ff.; other 'spondaic' poems: 152; genuineness of Messalla Collection: 153, 156 ff.; of *Catalepton*, ix: 159; *Ciris*: 160 ff.; *Aetna*: 163; *Culex*: *ib.*; criticism of Voss and Hertzberg: 154 ff.; of later writers: 156 f.; chronology of 'spondaic' poems: 159 ff., 164 ff.; table of dactyls and dactylic beginnings: 163; relative proportion of dactyls in epic and lyric: 165 f.; development of dactylic beginnings: 170 f.
- parles secanto*, in the XII Tables: xxv f.
- φρόνησις*: 98.
- φυσική*: 98 f.
- πίναξ πτυκτός*: 56 ff.
- Plato, influence on Pletho: 84 ff.; on exposure of infants: 142 f.
- Pletho, Gemistus, as a moral philosopher: 84 ff.; relation to earlier systems: *ib.*; the *περί ἀρετῶν*: 85 ff.; classification of virtues: 85 f.; influence of Stoic psychology: 86; *σωφροσύνη*: *ib.*; *κοσμιότης*: 87 f.; *ἐλευθεριότης*: 88; *μετρίότης*: 88 f.; *ἀνδρεία*: 89; *εὐψυχία*: 90 f.; *γενναιότης*: 92 f.; *πραότης*: 93 f.; *δικαιοσύνη*: 94 f.; *όσιότης*: 95 f.; *πολιτεία*: 96 f.; *χρηστότης*: 97 f.; *φρόνησις*: 98; *θεοσέβεια*: *ib.*; *φυσική*: 98 f.; *εὐβουλία*: 99; general conclusions: 99 f.
- Poet laureate, the Roman: xiv f.

πολιτεία: 96 f.

Pompeii, cult of emperor's genius in the forum: 128 ff.

πραότης: 93 f.

prorsus, uses of: 30 ff.; adjective: 30; adverb, spelling of: 30 f.; derivation: 31; 'forward': 31 f.; 'straitway': 32; 'utterly': 32 f.; 'in fact': 33 f., 36 f.; 'in short' (doubtful): 36 f.; effect of position on meaning: 34 ff.; belongs to colloquial language: 37; often wrongly left untranslated: 38 f.

Prudentius, and Christian humanism: 71 ff.; P. as artist and apologist: 72; his life: *ib.*; *Apotheosis* and *Hamartigeneia*: 72 ff.; influence of Lucretius and Vergil: 73 ff.; *Peristephanon*: 75 f.; influence of Horace: 75 f.; hymns (*Cathemerion*): 76 ff.; compared with those of St. Ambrose: 76 ff.; pagan element in them: 79 f.; [*Hexameron*]: 81; *Psychomachia*: *ib.*; *contra Symmachum*: 81 f.

Roman poet laureate, the: xiv f.

Roman religion: v. Augustus.

Sacerdos Augusti: 121, 123; v. Augustus.

σήματα λυγρά: 56 ff.

Sermo cottidianus: 37.

Simile: v. Homer.

σωφροσύνη: 86.

Spondees: v. Dactyls.

Spontaneous generation, and kindred notions, in antiquity: 101 ff.; prevalence of the theory: *ib.*; views of Aristotle: 103 ff., 107 f., 111 f.; insects: 103 ff.; bees: 106 f.; fish: 107 f.; eels: 108 f.; mice: 109; frogs: 109 f.; snakes: 110; in-

fluence of wind: 110 f.; of water: 111; xenogenesis: 111 f.; showers of animals: 112; the theory among the Church Fathers: 113; in modern times: 113 f.; attack upon it: 114.

Stoic influence on Pletho: 84 ff.

Tablet, of Bellerophon: 56 ff.

Tauric Maiden, the, and allied cults: 40 ff.; in Old Russian literature: *ib.*; the White Swan of the Russian byliny: *ib.*; Avdotya: 40 f.; Marya: 41 f.; elements foreign to Holy Russia: 43; her power of transformation: 43 f.; probably a bird-goddess: 44 ff.; Obida in the *Armament of Igor*: 44 f.; Tjektschäkäi in Tatar legend: 45; Iphigenia as an independent goddess: 46 f.; relation to the 'Persian Artemis': 47; Tauric Maiden identified with Greek Artemis: 47 ff.; Iphigenia as wife of Achilles on Leuce: 49; Helen do.: 51; survival of Tauric Maiden as Swan-Maiden of Slavs: 52 ff.; summary: 54 f.

θεοσέβεια: 98.

Thermopylae and Artemisium: 5 ff.; chronological error in Herodotus' account: *ib.*; battles on land and sea not synchronous: 8 ff.; time of first naval battle: 11 ff.; cause of evacuation of Thermopylae: 14 ff.

Tjektschäkäi in Tatar legend: 45.

Twelve Tables, the: v. *partes secanto*.

Vergil, influence on Prudentius: 73 ff.; v. Homer.

Writing, early knowledge of, among the Greeks: 63.

Xenogenesis: 111 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RECORD

OR THE CALENDAR YEAR 1920

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS

<i>A.A.</i> — Art and Archaeology.	<i>L.C.L.</i> — Loeb Classical Library.
<i>A.H.R.</i> — American Historical Review.	<i>M.</i> — Magazine.
<i>A.J.A.</i> — American Journal of Archaeology.	<i>M.L.A.</i> — Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.
<i>A.J.P.</i> — American Journal of Philology.	<i>M.L.N.</i> — Modern Language Notes
<i>Am.</i> — American.	<i>M.P.</i> — Modern Philology.
<i>A.Y.B.</i> — American Year Book.	<i>Nat.</i> — Nation.
<i>B.</i> — Bulletin.	<i>N.I.Y.B.</i> — New International Year Book.
<i>C.J.</i> — Classical Journal.	<i>P.A.P.A.</i> — Proceedings of the American Philological Association.
<i>C.P.</i> — Classical Philology.	<i>Pr.</i> — Press.
<i>C.Q.</i> — Classical Quarterly.	<i>Qu.</i> — Quarterly.
<i>C.R.</i> — Classical Review.	<i>Rev.</i> — Review.
<i>C.W.</i> — Classical Weekly.	<i>Rom.R.</i> — Romanic Review.
<i>E.R.</i> — Educational Review.	<i>S.P.</i> — Studies in Philology.
<i>H.S.C.P.</i> — Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.	<i>T.A.P.A.</i> — Transactions of the American Philological Association.
<i>J.</i> — Journal.	<i>U.</i> — University.
<i>J.A.O.S.</i> — Journal of the American Oriental Society.	<i>U.C.P.</i> — University of California Publications.
<i>J.E.G.P.</i> — Journal of English and Germanic Philology.	
<i>J.H.S.</i> — Journal of Hellenic Studies.	

FRANK FROST ABBOTT.

- Rev. of Gsell's *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du nord*, Tome IV; *A.H.R.* xxv, 701 f.
- Rev. of Jolliffe's Phases of corruption in Roman administration in the last half-century of the Roman republic; *ib.* xxvi, 125 f.

RAYMOND M. ALDEN.

- Rev. of Shafer's English ode; *J.E.G.P.* xviii, 636-638.
- The lyrical conceits of the metaphysical poets; *S.P.* xvii, 183-198.
- The essay, Letters in literature, Literary forms, Lyric poetry, Narrative poetry, Poetry, Shakespeare's sonnets, Tottel's Miscellany; *Ency. Americana*.

HENRY H. ARMSTRONG.

- President's welcome; *Bull. Wis. Ass'n Mod. For. Lang. Teachers*, no. 17, pp. 2-3.

LEROY C. BARRET.

- The Kashmirian Atharva Veda, vii; *J.A.O.S.* xl, 145-169.
- Pāippalāda and Rig Veda; *Studies in honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, 1-18; Yale U. Pr.

HENRY JEWELL BASSETT.

- Macrinus and Diadumenianus; Doctor's diss., U. of Mich.; pp. 94; Menasha, Wis.: Geo. Banta Publishing Co.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

- Βουκολικόν*; *C.P.* xv, 54-60.
- Hector's charioteer; *ib.* 296 f.
- Homeric criticism applied to Plato; *C.J.* xv, 499.
- That young prig Telemachus; *Sewanee Rev.* xxviii, 160-171.
- Paris-Alexander; *C.W.* xiv, 19 f.
- Rev. of Finsler's Homer, 11²; *ib.* 55 f.
- "Ἰσπερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς (Cicero, *All.* 1, 16, 1); *H.S.C.P.* xxxi, 39-62.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

Editor: *Archaeological News and Discussions*; *A.J.A.* xxiv, 85-117; 173-215; 291-312; 371-403.

Editor: *Bibliography of archaeological books*, 1919; *ib.* xxiv, 275-290.

Stormbound; *Weekly Rev.*, June 16, 623.

W. J. BATTLE.

Greece at the peace table: *C.J.* xvi, 2-14.

CLARENCE P. BILL.

Editor: *T.A.P.A.*, *P.A.P.A.*

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

The dohada or craving of pregnant women: a motif of Hindu fiction; *J.A.O.S.* xl, 1-24.

Fifty years of comparative philology in America; *T.A.P.A.* l, 62-83.

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK.

Rev. of Platnauer's *Life and reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus*; *C.W.* xiii, 79 f.

Rev. of Sweet's *Roman emperor worship*; *ib.* xiv, 7 f.

Rev. of Frank's *Economic history of Rome*; *ib.* 61-63.

CAMPBELL BONNER.

The trial of St. Eugenia; *A.J.P.* xli, 253-264.

ELLA BOURNE.

Petrarch on Augustus' Letters; *A.J.P.* xli, 287.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

The fiction of Frank R. Stockton; *Sewanee Rev.* xxviii, 452.

Hamlin Garland, El cuentista del oeste central; *Inter-America*, iv, 144.

Jack London's place in American literature; *Reformed Church Rev.* xxiv, 306.

ALICE F. BRÄUNLICH.

The indicative indirect question in Latin; pp. xxxi + 211; private edition, distributed by the U. of Chicago Libraries.

ETHEL HAMPSON BREWSTER.

Modern antiquities; *C.W.* xiii, 121-126.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

A semantic note; *C.P.* xv, 38-45.
Hittite an Indo-European language? *C.P.* xv, 184-192, 203 f.
"Empty" from "free"; *C.P.* xv, 198.

GEORGE MILLER CALHOUN.

Oral and written pleading in Athenian courts; *T.A.P.A.* l, 177-193.

Editor: *U. of Cal. Chronicle*.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

Freedom of speech; pp. vii + 431; New York: Harcourt, Brace & Howe, Inc.

GEORGE H. CHASE.

Archaeology in 1918; *C.J.* xv, 294-299.

EDWARD C. CHICKERING.

Rev. of Wye's *Primus annus*; *C.W.* xiii, 206 f.

Rev. of Mainwaring and Paine's *Secundus annus*; *ib.* 207 f.

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

Collectanea Hispanica; *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences*, xxiv, 1-243.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

The causes of phonetic change; *Johns Hopkins U. Circular*, no. 325, 30-32.

Anglo-Saxon *rafnan*; *ib.* 52-54.

Three philological anniversaries; *ib.* 64.

LANE COOPER.

Good usage; *U. Cal. Chronicle*, xxii, 259-269.

Cicero and others in "Things new and old"; *C.W.* XIV, 51 f.
 A pun in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle; *A.J.P.* XLI, 48-56.
 The university president; *Rev.* II, 410-412 (reprinted in *B. Am. Ass'n Univ. Professors*, VI, 14-18).
 Greek culture; pp. 16; reprinted for private circulation from *Ency. Americana*, XIII, 384-387.
 Rev. of Oldfather, Pease, and Canter's Index verborum quae in Senecae fabulis necnon in *Octavia praetexta* reperiuntur; *J.E.G.P.* XIX, 406-409.
 Rev. of Sedgwick's Dante, an elementary book [etc.]; *ib.* 434 f.

CORNELIA C. COULTER.

Two of E. K.'s classical allusions; *M.L.N.* XXXV, 55 f.
 The Plautine tradition in Shakespeare; *J.E.G.P.* XIX, 66-83.

JOHN R. CRAWFORD.

De Bruma et Brumalibus festis; *Byz. Zeitschr.* XXIII, 365-396.

MILDRED DEAN.

The Catilinarian orations: a milestone in the progress of democratic government; *C.W.* XIV, 2 f.
 The high school Latin course; *ib.* 37-39.
 Three Latin playlets; *ib.* 71 f.
 Rev. of Lupold's Introduction to Latin; *ib.* XIII, 135 f.

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM.

Rev. of Holtzhausser's Epigraphic commentary on Suetonius's *Life of Tiberius*; *C.W.* XIII, 196 f.
 Rev. of Price's *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum liber VIII Divus Titus*; *ib.*

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

Anthropology and the classics; *C.W.* XIV, 41-44.

WILLIAM S. EBERSOLE.

Some ancient Chinese sculptures; *Far Eastern Repub.* II, 215 f.
 Rev. of Herford's Handbook of Greek vase painting; *C.J.* XV, 510-512.

H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH.

L'école publique américaine; *L'Éducateur* (Lausanne, Switzerland), Oct., 1918, 5-12.
 Virgil, vol. II (L.C.L.); *Aen.* VII-XII, Minor poems; London, 1918: Heinemann.
 The American Red Cross in Montenegro; *Annual Report of the American National Red Cross*, for the year ending June 30, 1919.
 [The preceding items were omitted from the volumes in which they belonged because of the author's absence on war service.]

ROY C. FLICKINGER.

A British Horatius; *C.J.* XV, 499.
 Songs in the Latin class; *The Scroll*, XVI, 12 f.

B. O. FOSTER.

Livy (L.C.L.); in thirteen volumes, vol. I: Books I and II; pp. xxxvi + 447; London: William Heineman.

FRANK HAMILTON FOWLER.

Clauses of willed result; *C.P.* XV, 46-53.

WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX.

Aphrodite: Mother Earth; *A.J.P.* XLI, 283-286.

TENNEY FRANK.

An economic history of Rome, to the end of the Republic; pp. ix + 310; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Pr.
 Vergil's apprenticeship, I: The *Culex*, Vergil and Horace, *Catalepton*, IX; *C.P.* XV, 23-38.
 II: The *Ciris*, Vergil in the garden; *ib.* 103-119.

- Vergil's theory of his art: *ib.* 230-244.
 Heliodorus-Apollodorus: Horace, *Serm.* I, 5, 2; *ib.* 393.
 Vergil's *Res Romanae*: *C.Q.* XIV, 156-159.
 Catullus and Horace on Suffenus and Alfenus; *ib.* 160-162.
 Epicurean determinism in the *Aeneid*; *A.J.P.* XLI, 115-126.
 Tulliana: *Att.* XVI, 11, 1; The Vatinian law; *Att.* I, 16, 10; Curtius Postumus; *Q. Fr.* II, 8, 3; *Att.* XII, 6, 2; *ib.* 275-282.
 Cornificius as Daphnis; *C.R.* XXXIV, 49-51.
 Tidas the neoteric poet; *ib.* 91-93.
 Various reviews.
- ROBERT MAX GARRETT.
 The poetry of Australia; *Pacific Rev.* I, 278-294.
 Reading list of English-Canadian literature, U. of Wash.; Seattle.
 A word-list from the Northwest; *Dialect Notes*, v, 80-84.
- JOHN L. GERIG.
 Modern philology; *N.I. Y.B.* 521-525.
 Doctoral dissertations in the Romance languages at Yale University: a survey and bibliography; *Rom. R.* XI, 70-75.
 Rev. of Fisher's Mystic vision in the Grail legend and in the *Divine Comedy*; *Rom. R.* XI, 87-92.
 Why we should know Rumania better, and how Rumania can help us to attain that knowledge; *Steaua Noastră și România Nouă*, IX, 7-9.
 The Armenian language; *New Armenia*, XII, 86 f.
 Associate editor: *Rom. R.*
- WILLIAM CHASE GREENE.
 The spirit of comedy in Plato; *H.S.C.P.* XXXI, 63-123.
- Pedagogues as propagandists? *Weekly Rev.* III, 245 f.
- ALFRED GUDEMAN.
 Aristoteles, *Ueber die Dichtkunst*, neu übersetzt und mit Einleitung und einem erklärenden Namen- und Sachverzeichnis versehen; pp. xxiv + 91; Leipzig.
- RICHARD M. GUMMERE.
 The Epistles of Seneca, vol. II (L.C.L.); Heinemann and Putnam.
 Major Latin, Book II; Philadelphia: Christopher Sower & Co. (with J. E. Forsythe).
 Rev. of Francis Holland's Seneca; *C.W.*
 Rev. of T. Frank's Economic history of Rome; *N. Y. Evening Post*.
 Rev. of G. C. Fiske's Lucilius and Horace; *N. Y. Evening Post*.
- GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS.
 Rev. of Armstrong's Significance of certain colors in Roman ritual; *C.W.* XIII, 77-79.
 Rev. of Herford's Poetry of Lucretius; *C.J.* XV, 318-320.
 The classics in a democracy; *ib.* 226-234.
 Going to church in ancient Rome; *University Lectures* (U. of Penn.), VII, 381-403.
 Media of salvation; *C.W.* XIV, 70 f.
 The joy of learning; 28 pp.; Philadelphia: Am. Educational Institute.
 General editor: *Elementa prima*, pp. 460, L. D. Whittemore; Philadelphia: Jno. C. Winston Co.
- E. ADELAIDE HAHN.
 On an alleged inconsistency in the *Aeneid* (between II, 781 and III); *C.W.* XIII, 209-212.
 Note on Vergil's use of *Anchisiades*; *ib.* XIV, 3 f.

G. A. HARRER.

Rev. of W. D. Gray's Study of the life of Hadrian prior to his accession; *C.W.* XIII, 95 f.

Rev. of Ferrero and Barbagallo's Short history of Rome; *ib.* XIV, 20 f.

Tacitus and Tiberius; *A.J.P.* XLI, 57-68.

A thirteenth-century fragment of Justinian's *Digest*; *S.P.* XVII, 361-378 (with J. S. Moffatt.)

KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON.

The chapel service book for schools and colleges; pp. xix + 361; New York: Abingdon Press (with James S. Stevens and Abram W. Harris).

The place of Sulpicius Severus in miracle-literature; *C.J.* xv, 465-474.

An open questionnaire; *Christian Advocate*, xcv, 191 f.

VICTOR DWIGHT HILL.

Rev. of Poynton's *Flosculi Graeci*; *C.J.* xvi, 189 f.

Rev. of Marchant's *Xenophontis opera omnia* (Oxford text), v; *ib.* 190.

Rev. of Postgate's *Phaedri Fabulae Aesopiae* (Oxford text); *ib.* 191.

Rev. of Freeman's Latin poetry from Catullus to Claudian; *ib.* 191 f.

GEORGE HOWE.

An applied literature; *S.P.* xvii, 423-438.

HARRY M. HUBBELL.

The *Rhetorica* of Philodemus: translation and commentary; *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts and Sciences*, XXIII, 243-382.

A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON.

Early Persian poetry, from the beginnings down to the time of Firdausi; pp. xxii + 125; New York: Macmillan Co.

To what place was King Jamshid's ancient fire-temple removed? *Sanj Vartaman* (Bombay), Sept. 10, p. a16.

Rev. of Keith's Samkhya system; *N. Y. Evening Post*, Aug. 21.

Rev. of Browne's History of Persian literature under Tartar dominion (A.D. 1265-1502); *Nat.* CXI, 508.

RICHARD ORLANDO JOLLIFFE.

Phases of corruption in Roman administration in the last half-century of the Roman republic; pp. xi + 109; Menasha, Wis.: Collegiate Pr.

Rev. of W. Warde Fowler's Roman essays and interpretations; *Canadian Bookman*, II, 85-87.

ARTHUR LESLIE KEITH.

The spirit of Horace; *Sewanee Rev.*, Oct., 573-596.

The lonely word in Vergil; *C.W.* XIV, 36 f.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

Rev. of Cudworth's *The Odes and Secular Hymn* of Horace Englished into rimed verse corresponding to the original meters; *C.W.* XIV, 23 f.

Rev. of Geyser's *Musa Americana* (third series): Latin odes in classic metres; *C.W.* XIV, 53 ff.

Report of *Philologus*, LXXV (N. F. XXIX), 1909, 1-2, *A.J.P.* XL, 438-444; 3-4, *ib.* XLI, 388-393.

ROLAND G. KENT.

Indo-European philology; *A. Y. B.* 793-795.

Some big timbers of antiquity; *Am. Lumberman*, May 15, p. 63.

English word formation and etymology; *Penn. State Educ. Ass'n*, 213-217.

The Latin language in the fourth century; *T.A.P.A.* L, 91-100.

Studies in the Iguvine tables; *C.P.* xv, 354-369.

The edict of Diocletian fixing maximum prices; *U. Penn. Law Register*, LXIX, 35-47.

WM. HAMILTON KIRK.

The accusative of specification in Latin; *C.W.* XIII, 91 f., 98 f.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Literature, Latin; *A.Y.B.* 790-792.

Philology, classical; *N.I.Y.B.* 517-521.

Analysis of Horace, *Serm.* II, 3; *C.W.* XIII, 73-75.

Rev. of Recent translations of the classics (especially in the Loeb Classical Library); *ib.* 145-147, 153 f., 161 f., 169 f.

Studies in the Catilinarian orations; *ib.* 193-196, 201-204.

Managing editor: *C.W.* Editorial and other contributions (including reviews and book notices), esp. XIII, 88, 89 f., 97 f., 104, 105 f., 113-115, 128, 137 f., 152, 160, 185, 192, 200, 208, 223; XIV, 1, 9-11, 16, 48, 49 f., 57-59, 65 f.

CHARLES ROCKWELL LANMAN.

Sanskrit mutes called Mürdhanya, that is, Domal; *Festgabe Adolf Kaegi* (of Zürich, Switzerland), 93-101.

Phrase-words and phrase-derivatives; *J.A.O.S.* XL, 194-198.

The Sanskrit passive-stem; *J.A.O.S.* XL, 199.

India and the West, with a plea for team-work among scholars; address of president of the American Oriental Society; *J.A.O.S.* XL, 225-247.

Editor: Harvard Oriental Series; Cambridge, Mass.: Harv. U. Pr. Vol. xxv, *Rig-Veda Brāhmaṇas*: The Aitareya and Kāusītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rig-Veda, translated by Arthur Berriedale Keith; pp. 567.

DAVID RUSSELL LEF.

Child-Life, adolescence and marriage in Greek New Comedy and in the Comedies of Plautus; pp. x + 76; Menasha, Wis.: Geo. Banta Publishing Co.

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY.

How and why: "just so" mythology in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*; *C.J.* xv, 260-278.

Marginalia from Vergil; *C.W.* XIII, 217-221.

The spirit of ancient sacrifice; *ib.* XIV, 40.

Forerunners of the Romance adverbial suffix; *C.P.* xv, 213-229.

A. P. MCKINLAY.

The correlation of Latin and English; *C.J.* xv, 358-364.

DAVID MAGIE.

Augustus' war in Spain (26-25 B.C.); *C.P.* xv, 323-339.

Roman policy in Armenia and Transcaucasia; *Annual Report of the Am. Hist. Ass'n.*

Rev. of K. Aslan's Armenia and the Armenians from the earliest times until the Great War; *A.H.R.* xxv, 748.

CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING.

Russia and Antichrist; *Am. Church Monthly*, VII, 351-362.

The false Christs of Russia; *ib.* VIII, 328-342.

ALLAN MARQUAND.

Giovanni della Robbia; pp. xxiv + 233; Princeton, London, Oxford: Princeton U. Pr., Oxford U. Pr.

Mino da Fiesole; *A.A.* IX, 223-230.

A new document for the Ceppo hospital medallions; *A.J.A.* XXIV, 269 f.

WILLIAM STUART MESSER.

Mutiny in the Roman army: the Republic; *C.P.* xv, 158-175.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

Vocalic harmony in Fox; *A.J.P.* xli, 181-183.

Note on the linguistic affinities of Ardhamāgadhī Prākṛit; *ib.* 265-274.

Rev. of Swanton's Structural and lexical comparison of the Tunica, Chitimacha, and Atakapa languages; *ib.* 305.

Rev. of Speck's Penobscot transformer tales; *ib.* 305 f.

CHARLES C. MIEROW.

How a city lapsed into savagery; *Springfield Daily Republican*, March 8.

"Just a lyin' there, ye know": a case of crepitant rales; *Springfield Sunday Republican*, April 25.

HERBERT EDWARD MIEROW.

The Hermes of Praxiteles; *A.A.* x, 191.

The engineers; *Albany Evening Journal*, xc, 6.

C. W. E. MILLER.

Report of *Rh. Mus.* lxxii, 3-4; *A.J.P.* xli, 288-292.

Editor: *A.J.P.*

FRANK J. MILLER.

Some features of Ovid's style, II: The dramatic element in the *Metamorphoses*; *C.J.* xv, 417-435.

CLIFFORD H. MOORE.

The pagan reaction in the late fourth century; *T.A.P.A.* l, 122-134.

Life in the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian Era; in *The beginnings of Christianity* (ed. by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake), i, 218-262; London: Macmillan Co.

Sundry reviews.

FRANK G. MOORE.

A history of the American Philological Association; *T.A.P.A.* l, 5-32.

Nenia (Latin poem); *Barnard Bear*, xv, 10 (reprinted from *C.W.* xiii, 40).

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

Rev. of Stewart and Rand's Boethius: the Theological Tractates and the *Consolation of Philosophy*; *A.J.P.* xli, 85.

Notice of H. T. Weiskotten's Sancti Augustini vita scripta a Possidio Episcopo; *ib.* 85 f.

Reports of *Rev. de Phil.* xlii, 3-4; *ib.* 91.

Rev. of F. Villeneuve's *Essai sur Perse*; *ib.* 184 f.

Notice of Helen Price's *C. Suetonii Tranquilli de Vita Caesarum Liber VIII*; *ib.* 186 f.

Report of *Riv. di Fil.* xlviii; *ib.* 192-196.

Report of *Rev. de Phil.* xliii, 1-2; *ib.* 196-198.

Notices of Haines' *Fronto*, vol. i, Ker's *Martial*, vol. i, White's *Ausonius*, vol. i (L.C.L.); *ib.* 297 f.

Notice of I. M. Linforth's *Solon the Athenian*; *ib.* 400.

Illustrations of Tacitus; *C.W.* xiii, 87.

Tasso's Debt to Vergil; *ib.* 115-120.

Rev. of E. Nitchie's *Vergil and the English poets*; *J.E.G.P.* xix, 298-300.

Notes on *The Shepherdes Calender*; *M.L.N.* xxxv, 371 f.

Martial, the epigrammatist, and other essays; by Kirby Flower Smith; revised and edited; 179 pp; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins U. Pr.

H. C. NUTTING.

The pay of teachers; *C.W.* xiii, 88. New or old? *ib.* xiv, 31.

Interrupted sequence; *ib.* 31 f.

Latin as a tool; *C.J.* xv, 385-387.

Situlae; *ib.* 535-545.

Notes on the *cum*-construction; *ib.* xvi, 26-33.

The Latin in English; *ib.* 171-176.

The humanity of the ancients; *U. of Cal. Chronicle*, xxii, 386-394.

The ablative as an appositive; *C.P.* xv, 389-392.

Joint-editor: *C.J.*

IRENE NYE.

A rescue! A Cannan to the rescue! *C.J.* xvi, 52 f.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

Articles mainly on Locris, about 20 in number, covering the first part of the letter K, in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie*, x-xi.

Euripides, *Tro.* 1180-1184; *C.W.* xiii, 96.

Rev. of A. E. R. Boak's Master of the offices; *ib.* xiv, 39 f.

Notes on the text of Asklepiodotos; *A.J.P.* xli, 127-146.

Note on the etymology of *παπα-κλαυσίθρον*; *ib.* 356-358.

A note on the etymology of the word *ceramic*; *J. Am. Ceram. Soc.* iii, 537-542.

Rev. of O. Immisch's *Das Erbe der Alten*; *C.J.* xv, 447 f.

Editor: *U. of Ill. Studies in Language and Literature*, vi.

SAMUEL GRANT OLIPHANT.

The Vedic press-stones; *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, 225-250.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

Is the *Octavia* a play of Seneca? *C.J.* xv, 388-403.

The son of Croesus; *C.P.* xv, 201 f.

The attitude of Jerome towards pagan literature; *T.A.P.A.* L, 150-167.

The museum of classical archaeology and art; in *Sixteen years at the University of Illinois*, 121-124.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

Rev. of Loeb's translation of Legrand's New Greek Comedy; *A.J.P.* xli, 301 f.

Rev. of Warren's Foundations of classical architecture; *South Atlantic Qu.* xix, 368-371.

BEN EDWIN PERRY.

The *Metamorphoses* ascribed to Lucius of Patrae: its content, nature, and authorship; pp. v + 74; Lancaster, Pa.: New Era Pr.

CLYDE PHARR.

Homeric Greek, a book for beginners; pp. xlii + 391; New York: D. C. Heath & Co.

ARISTIDES E. PHOUTRIDES.

Modern Greek stories; pp. 270; New York: Duffield Company (with Demetra Vaca).

George Soures; *C.J.* xv, 235 ff.

Soures and his world; *ib.* 494 ff.

George Soures, an Athenian satirist; *Rev.* ii, 211 ff.

Andreas Karkavitsas, a story writer of New Greece; *Weekly Rev.* iii, 566 ff.

Rev. of Paxton Hibben's *Constantine I and the Greek people*; *ib.* 170 ff.

Rev. of V. T. Seligman's *Salonica side show*; *ib.* 450 ff.

Rev. of V. T. Seligman's *Victory of Venizelos*; *ib.* 621.

Rev. of Herbert Adams Gibbons' *Venizelos*; *ib.* 621 ff.

Vernacular and revolution; *Survey*, xlv, 8 ff.

HUBERT MCNEILL POTEAT.

The teaching of Latin prose composition; *Proceedings of the N. C. Teachers' Assembly*, 196-198.

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE.

The teaching of the classics; chap. xx in *College teaching*, ed. Paul Klapper; pp. 404-423; Yonkers, N. Y.: World Book Co.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

Inorganic rôles in Roman comedy;
C.P. xv, 245-281.

R. S. RADFORD.

Licensed feet in Latin verse; a study of the principles of exceptional shortening, of diaeresis, and of short vowels in hiatus; *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*.

E. K. RAND.

The supposed autographa of John the Scot; *U.C.P.* v, 135-141, plates 1-11.

Rev. of K. F. Smith's *Martial the epigrammatist and other essays*; *A.J.P.* xli, 394-396.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Pharisees and Jesus; Charles Scribner's Sons.

Luke the historian in the light of research; pp. x + 257.

The cry for Christ today; *Bibl. World*, Jan.

Philemon and Onesimus, master and slave; *Expositor* (London), Jan.

The Christ of Luke's Gospel; *ib.* July.

Luke's method of research; *Bibl. Rev.*, April.

The romance of the census in Luke's Gospel; *ib.* Oct.

Broadus the Preacher; *Methodist Rev.*, April.

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON.

A Roman terra-cotta savings-bank at the Johns Hopkins University; *A.J.A.* xxiv, 78 f.

Pergamum and Ephesus; *A.A.* ix, 157-170.

The ninth annual meeting of the College Art Association of America; *ib.* 247.

Rev. of Harris' *Origin and meaning of apple cults*; *ib.* 98.

Rev. of Pennell's *Etchers and etching*; *ib.* x, 157.

Rev. of Ethel Dana's *Story of Jesus: pictures from paintings by Giotto, Angelico, Duccio, Ghirlandaio, etc.*; *ib.* 203.

Rev. of Hill's *Medals of the Renaissance*; *ib.* 246 f.

Rev. of Beazley's *Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems*; *ib.* 247 f.

Rev. of Beazley's *Attic red-figured vases in American museums*; *ib.* 249.

Rev. of Hoppin's *Handbook of Attic red-figured vases*; *ib.* 157, *Art Bulletin*, II, 123-128.

Rev. of Kimball and Edgell's *History of architecture*; *Art Bulletin*, II, 176-178.

Rev. of Herford's *Handbook of Greek vase painting*; *ib.* 178-181.

Rev. of Warren's *Foundations of classic architecture*; *ib.* 225-227.

Rev. of *Memoirs of the American Academy at Rome*, II; *A.J.P.* xli, 87 f., *A.A.* ix, 98 f.

Editor: *Proceedings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Ass'n, 1919-1920*; *Johns Hopkins U. Circular*, no. 325, 27-64.

Editor-in-chief: *Art Bulletin*.

Associate Editor: *C.W.*, *A.A.*, *A.J.P.*

JOHN C. ROLFE.

Claudian; *T.A.P.A.* L, 135 ff.

Marginalia; *S.P.* xvii, 402 ff.

Reviews of Fowler's *Aeneas at the site of Rome and The death of Turnus*; *C.W.* xiii, 198 f.

CLARENCE F. ROSS.

Education for democracy; *E. R.* LIX, 381-394.

EVAN T. SAGE.

The *senatus consultum ultimum*; *C.W.* xiii, 185 ff.

The non-Virgilian Aeneas; *C.J.* xv, 350 ff.

The publication of Martial's poems; *T.A.P.A.* L, 168 ff.

The classics for engineers; *B. Soc. for the Promotion of Engineering Educ.* x, 364 ff.

Editor: *U. of Pittsburgh Latin Dep't News Letter*.

HENRY S. SCRIBNER.

Cicero as a Hellenist; *C.J.* xvi, 81-92.

EDWARD S. SHELDON.

Romance and Romanic; *S.P.* xvii, 88-92.

Rev. of Tanqueray's *Evolution du verbe en anglo-français*, and his *Recueil de lettres anglo-françaises*; *M.L.N.* xxxv, 294-302.

Some Roland emendations; *M.P.* xviii, 143-145.

GRANT SHOWERMAN.

Liberal culture in action; *Nat.* cx, 134-136.

E. G. SIHLER.

In the era of the Emperor Diocletian; *Bibl. Rev.*, April.

The Emperor Julian and his religion; *ib.* Oct.

Quintilian of Calagurris: an essay; *A.J.P.* no. 3.

Notes on the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament; *Theol. Qu.* (St. Louis), 196-207.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

A Greek grammar for colleges; pp. vi + 784; New York: American Book Co.

Unlisted fragments of Aeschylus; *A.J.P.* xli, 101-114.

KENDALL K. SMITH.

Rev. of Hibben's *Constantine I and the Greek people*; *Chr. Sci. Mon.* xii, no. 248, p. 12.

Rev. of Bok's *The Americanization of Edward Bok*; *ib.* 302, 12.

In defence of Venizelos; *New Repub.* 310, 272 f.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

The pronunciation of Greek and Latin, the sounds and accents; pp. xiv + 225; Chicago: U. of Chicago Pr.

A prehistoric Mediterranean stem in Greek and Latin; *P.A.P.A.* i, xiv.

The Italic languages; *C.W.* xiv, 66-69.

ROLLIN H. TANNER.

An application of the laboratory method to the teaching of Greek and Latin; *C.J.* xv, 546-554.

FRANK BIGELOW TARBELL.

Centauiromachy and Amazonomachy; *A.J.A.* xxiv, 226-231.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

Rev. of Grim's *Astronomical lore in Chaucer*; *J.E.G.P.* xix, 129 f.

ARCHER TAYLOR.

"O du armer Judas"; *J.E.G.P.* xix, 318-339.

HERBERT CUSHING TOLMAN.

Phi Beta Kappa address; *Phi Beta Kappa Key*, iv, 227 ff.

An erroneous etymology of New Persian *pādšāh* in relation to the pr. n. *Παρισηθης* (Hdt. iii, 61); *J.A.O.S.* xl, 200 ff.

B. L. ULLMAN.

The present status of the *satura* question; *S.P.* xvii, 379-401.

Cicero and politics; *U. of Iowa Service B.* iii, 43.

English and Latin; *ib.* iv, 21.

Of things classical; *Iowa Alumnus*, xvii, 423-425.

Rev. of Pascal's *Q. Valerii Catulli carmina*; *C.P.* xv, 210 f.

Rev. of Postgate's *M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili liber viii*; *ib.* 212.

Rev. of Housman's *M. Manilii Astronomicon liber tertius*; *ib.* 305 f.

Rev. of Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores*, v: Dracontius; *ib.* 306 f.
Hints for teachers; *C.J.* xvi, 185-187.
Associate Editor: *C.J.*

LA RUE VAN HOOK.
Greek literature; *Ency. Americana*, 13.
Rev. of Oxyrhyncus Papyri, XIII; *C.W.* xiv, 14-16.

MARGARET C. WAITES.
Satura rediviva; *A.J.P.* xv, 308 f.
The nature of the Lares and their representation in Roman art; *A.J.A.* xxiv, 241 f.

RAYMOND WEEKS.
Young Stephen; *Romania Noua*, ix, 15.
Contributions; *ib.* 51-53.
Little history of the Great War, by H. Vast, translated from the French; 262 pp.; New York: Holt.
"La plus belle lettre de la guerre"; *J. Franco-Am. Soc.* III, 8.
A la maison française; pp. 213; Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co. (with L. Cardon).
The Siège de Barbastre; *Rom. R.* xi, 349-369.

General editor: Molière, *Les femmes savantes*, C. H. C. Wright; New York: Oxford U. Pr.

Joint editor: *Rom. R.*

MONROE NICHOLS WETMORE.

Semi-centennial anniversary of the American Philological Association; *C.J.* xv, 257-259.

Recent meeting of the Classical Association of New England; *ib.* 450-453.

Rev. of *Index verborum quae in Senecae Fabulis necnon in Octavia praetexta reperiuntur*, a Guilielmo Abbott Oldfather, Arthur Stanley Pease, Howard Vernon Canter confectus; *C.W.* xiii, 102 f.

Rev. of Classical studies in honor of Charles Forster Smith; *ib.* 183 f.

Joint editor: *C.J.*

ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER.

Catullus as a story-teller; *P.A.P.A.* L, xv.

Contributing editor: *A.J.A.*

JOHN GARRETT WINTER.

Illustrations of Tacitus; *C.W.* xiii, 144.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1920-1921

PRESIDENT

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL

VICE-PRESIDENTS

FRANCIS GREENLEAF ALLINSON

EDWARD KENNARD RAND

SECRETARY AND TREASURER

CLARENCE P. BILL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The above-named officers, and —

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

RICHARD MOTT GUMMERE

MAURICE HUTTON

GORDON JENNINGS LAING

DUANE REED STUART

OFFICERS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST

PRESIDENT

WILLIAM A. COOPER

VICE-PRESIDENTS

MONROE E. DEUTSCH

CLIFFORD G. ALLEN

SECRETARY

PERCIVAL B. FAY

Succeeded by

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

TREASURER

GEORGE M. CALHOUN

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The above-named officers, and —

BENJAMIN O. FOSTER

ARTHUR P. McKINLAY

RUDOLPH SCHEVILL

EDWARD A. WICHER

MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION¹

1920-1921

- Dr. Elizabeth F. Abbe, Melrose High School, Melrose, Mass. 1919.
William F. Abbot, Classical High School, Worcester, Mass. (20 John St.). 1893.
Prof. Frank Frost Abbott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1886.
Prof. Arthur Adams, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1908.
Prof. Charles Darwin Adams, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1892.
* Dr. Louise Elizabeth Whetenhall Adams, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
1920.
Pres. Cyrus Adler, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. (2041 N. Broad St.).
1883.
Prof. Raymond M. Alden, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University,
Cal. 1914.
Albert H. Allen, 2817 Prospect St., Berkeley, Cal. 1900.
Bernard M. Allen, Cheshire, Conn. 1921.
Prof. Hamilton Ford Allen, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
1903.
Harold Douglass Allen, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
Prof. James T. Allen, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (37 Mosswood
Rd.). 1898.
Miss Jessie E. Allen, Girls' High School, 17th and Spring Garden Sts., Philadel-
phia, Pa. 1821.
Prof. Katharine Allen, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (228 Langdon
St.). 1899.
Dr. May Alice Allen, University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn. 1920.
* William Henry Allen, 3417 Walnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1917.
Dr. Anne C. E. Allinson, 163 George St., Providence, R. I. 1920.
* Prof. Francis G. Allinson, Brown University, Providence, R. I. (163 George
St.). Life member. 1893.
Prof. Clara Janet Allison, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.
1921.
Prof. Andrew Runni Anderson, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1905.
* Dr. Florence Mary Bennett Anderson (Mrs. L. F.), 364 Boyer Ave., Walla
Walla, Wash. (Life member). 1910.
Prof. Louis Francis Anderson, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. (364
Boyer Ave.). 1887.

¹ This list has been corrected up to October 15, 1921. The Secretary begs to be kept informed of all changes of address. Names marked with an asterisk are those of members who attended the Fifty-second Annual Meeting, held in Baltimore, Md., in December, 1920.

- George Allison Armour, Princeton, N. J. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. Henry H. Armstrong, 825 Park Ave., Beloit, Wis. 1906.
 Prof. William G. Aurelio, Boston University, Boston, Mass. (48 Pinckney St.).
 1903.
 Prof. James Curtiss Austin, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y. 1921.
 Prof. C. C. Ayer, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1902.
 Prof. Frank Cole Babbitt, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. (65 Vernon St.).
 1897.
 Prof. Earle Brownell Babcock, New York University, University Heights, New
 York, N. Y. 1913.
 Prof. Susan A. Bacon, Reed College, Portland, Ore. 1920.
 Prof. William Frederic Badé, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal. (2616
 College Ave.). 1903.
 * Dr. Lawrence Henry Baker, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1920.
 Prof. Allan P. Ball, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1905.
 Dr. Francis K. Ball, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1894.
 * Prof. Floyd G. Ballentine, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa. 1903.
 Dr. Susan H. Ballou, 822 E. Locust St., Davenport, Ia. 1912.
 Cecil K. Bancroft, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1898.
 Miss Edith Bancroft, 25 Sanborn St., Reading, Mass. 1921.
 Prof. Grove E. Barber, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb. (1320 L St.).
 1902.
 Prof. Amy L. Barbour, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (234 Crescent St.).
 1902.
 Louis Barnier, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1589 LeRoy Ave.).
 1921.
 * Prof. LeRoy C. Barret, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1906.
 J. Edmund Barss, Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn. 1897.
 Prof. George Lloyd Barton, Jr., Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.
 (Box 596). 1919.
 Prof. Herbert J. Barton, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1907.
 Prof. John W. Basore, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1902.
 * Prof. Henry Jewell Bassett, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind. 1919.
 Prof. Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. 1903.
 * Prof. William N. Bates, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (220 St.
 Mark's Square). 1894.
 Prof. William J. Battle, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1893.
 Prof. Paul V. C. Baur, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (166 Edgehill Rd.).
 1902.
 John W. Beach, 149 Calumet Ave., Aurora, Ill. 1902.
 Prof. Edward A. Bechtel, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.
 1900.
 Prof. Frederick E. Beckman, University of California, Southern Branch, Los
 Angeles, Cal. 1921.
 Prof. Isbon T. Beckwith, 35 W. 64th St., New York, N. Y. 1884.
 Prof. Charles H. Beeson, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. (1009 E. 60th St.).
 1897.

- Prof. Gertrude H. Beggs, Westhampton College, Richmond, Va. 1912.
 Prof. A. J. Bell, Victoria University, Toronto, Can. (17 Avenue Rd.). 1887.
 Alfred Raymond Bellinger, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (1285 Boulevard). 1920.
 Prof. Harold H. Bender, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1912.
 Prof. Allen R. Benner, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. 1901.
 † * Prof. Charles Edwin Bennett, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1882.
 Dr. Harold Bennett, College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C. 1921.
 ‡ Prof. John I. Bennett, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.
 Capt. Paul Benrimo, Bingham Military School, Asheville, N. C. 1921.
 Miss M. Julia Bentley, 3517 Middleton Ave., Cincinnati, O. 1920.
 Frank May Benton, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (Adams Hall). 1919.
 Prof. George O. Berg, St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. 1909.
 Pierre Arnold Bernard, Nyack, N. Y. 1913.
 Prof. Lillian G. Berry, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1916.
 Prof. Louis Bevier, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1884.
 * Dr. John Dean Bickford, Culver Military Academy, Culver, Ind. 1920.
 * Prof. Clarence P. Bill, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1894.
 Prof. Albert Billheimer, Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. 1912.
 * Prof. Arthur Vaughan Bishop, Hollins College, Hollins, Va. 1917.
 * Prof. Charles Edward Bishop, West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va. 1890.
 Prof. Elizabeth L. Bishop, Western College for Women, Oxford, O. 1919.
 § Prof. Robert W. Blake, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. 1894.
 Dr. Carl W. Blegen, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1920.
 Prof. Leonard Bloomfield, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1914.
 * Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1882.
 Dr. G. Alder Blumer, Duncan Lodge, Providence, R. I. 1921.
 Prof. A. E. R. Boak, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (815 Forest Ave.). 1920.
 Prof. Willis H. Bocock, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1890.
 Sister Mary Paschal Boillot, Dominican College, San Rafael, Cal. 1921.
 * Prof. George M. Bolling, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1897.
 Prof. Alexander L. Bondurant, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1892.
 Prof. Campbell Bonner, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1025 Martin Pl.). 1899.
 Prof. Robert J. Bonner, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1911.
 Prof. Benjamin Parsons Bourland, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1900.
 * Dr. Ella Bourne, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1916.
 Prof. Edwin W. Bowen, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1905.
 M. J. Boyer, 603 N. 6th St., Allentown, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. Haven D. Brackett, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. 1905.
 †† Died May 2, 1921. ‡ Died August 6, 1920. § Died January 27, 1921.

- Prof. Cornelius Beach Bradley, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2639 Durant Ave.). 1900.
- Prof. J. Everett Brady, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (5 Crescent St.). 1891.
- † Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1876.
- Dr. Joseph Granger Brandt, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1916.
- Prof. Carlos Bransby, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1604 Oxford St.). 1903.
- Dr. Alice F. Bräunlich, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. (2819 Guilford Ave.) 1916.
- Charles Henry Breed, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J. (Woodhull House). 1915.
- Prof. George Sidney Brett, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1920.
- * Prof. Ethel Hampson Brewster, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. (Life member). 1914.
- Frank Brewster, 75 Ames Building, Boston, Mass. 1920.
- Miss M. Gertrude Bricker, 4723 Baltimore Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Dr. Josiah Bridge, Simsbury, Conn. 1921.
- Prof. James W. Bright, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1887.
- Prof. George P. Bristol, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1914.
- Dr. Blanche M. E. Brotherton, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. 1921.
- Dr. Carroll N. Brown, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (25 Highland Ave., Yonkers). 1908.
- George Brown, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1919.
- Dr. Lester Dorman Brown, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1904.
- Prof. Ruth W. Brown, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal. 1912.
- Prof. Carleton L. Brownson, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1892.
- Dr. W. R. Bryan, American Academy, Rome, Italy. 1921.
- Dr. Arthur Alexis Bryant, De Witt Clinton High School, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. Carl D. Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1890.
- * Miss Mary H. Buckingham, 96 Chestnut St., Boston, 9, Mass. 1897.
- Dr. Theodore A. Buenger, 621 Addison St., Chicago, Ill. 1915.
- Frank S. Bunnell, 251 Washington St., Norwich, Conn. 1921.
- Dr. Mary C. Burchinall, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. Edmund Burke, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. Robert B. Burke, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. John M. Burnam, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (Life member). 1899.
- Prof. William S. Burrage, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1898.
- * Prof. Harry E. Burton, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1899.
- Prof. Orma Fitch Butler, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (1109 Forest Ave.). 1907.

† Died December 20, 1920.

- † Pres. Henry A. Buttz, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. 1869.
 Sister Marie José Byrne, College of St. Elizabeth, Convent, N. J. 1921.
 Prof. Alva J. Calderwood, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1917.
 Prof. George M. Calhoun, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1056 Euclid Ave.). 1911.
 Prof. T. Callander, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1919.
 Prof. Donald Cameron, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1905.
 Prof. Howard Vernon Canter, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. (Champagne, Ill.). 1921.
 Harry Caplan, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (107 Harvard Pl.). 1920.
 Seth Bunker Capp, Box 2054, Philadelphia, Pa. (Life member). 1914.
 Prof. Edward Capps, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1889.
 Prof. Albert J. Carnoy, 50 Rue des Joyeuses Entrées, Louvain, Belgium. 1915.
 * Dr. Rhys Carpenter, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1913.
 Prof. W. L. Carr, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. (73 S. Cedar Ave.). 1920.
 * Prof. Mitchell Carroll, Office of the Archaeological Institute, The Octagon, Washington, D. C. 1894.
 Prof. Adam Carruthers, University College, Toronto, Can. 1909.
 * Prof. Jane Gray Carter, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. 1920.
 Dr. Earnest Cary, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1905.
 William Van Allen Catron, Lexington, Mo. 1896.
 Miss Emma Cauthorn, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1916.
 * Prof. Julia H. Caverno, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1902.
 Arnold B. Chace, 99 Power St., Providence, R. I. 1920.
 Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass. (91 Irving St.). 1920.
 Prof. Angie Clara Chapin, 50 Saratoga Ave., Yonkers, N. Y. 1888.
 * Prof. Cleveland King Chase, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1911.
 Prof. George Davis Chase, University of Maine, Orono, Me. 1900.
 Prof. George H. Chase, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Shady Hill Square). 1899.
 Prof. W. H. Chenery, New York State Library School, Albany, N. Y. 1916.
 Arthur S. Chenoweth, Somers Point, N. J. 1921.
 Miss Helen M. Chesnutt, 9719 Lamont Ave., Cleveland, O. 1920.
 Edward C. Chickering, Jamaica High School, New York, N. Y. 1920.
 Prof. Gilbert Chinard, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1912.
 Dr. Ethel L. Chubb, 4209 Chester Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 ‡ William Churchill, F. R. A. I., Bishop Museum, Honolulu, T. H. 1910.
 Dr. Edith Frances Claflin, Rosemary Hall, Greenwich, Conn. 1919.
 * Prof. Charles Upson Clark, Room 916, 61 Broadway, N. Y. 1905.
 Miss Emma Kirkland Clark, 69 Centre St., Brookline, Mass. 1896.
 Prof. Frank Lowry Clark, Miami University, Oxford, O. 1919.
 Prof. Frederick William Clark, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manit., Can. 1920.
 Prof. Herman A. Clark, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore. 1920.
 Prof. Sereno Burton Clark, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1907.
 † Died October 6, 1920. ‡ Died July, 1920.

- Prof. Harold Loomis Cleasby, 805 Comstock Ave., Syracuse, N. Y. 1905.
 Miss Katharine M. Cochran, Ferry Hall, Lake Forest, Ill. 1914.
 Ernest A. Coffin, High School, Hartford, Conn. 1914.
 Dr. Harrison Cadwallader Coffin, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. 1920.
 Dr. George H. Cohen, 120 Capitol Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1914.
 Dr. James Wilfred Cohoon, Mt. Allison University, Sackville, N. B., Can. 1914.
 Prof. Guy Blandin Colburn, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. (Life member). 1911.
 Prof. Charles Nelson Cole, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1902.
 Dr. Erma Eloise Cole, Connecticut College for Women, New London, Conn. 1917.
 * Prof. Hermann Collitz, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (1027 N. Calvert St.). 1887.
 Miss Ruth Congdon, New Bedford, Mass. 1921.
 Prof. Elisha Conover, Delaware College, Newark, Del. 1921.
 Prof. Lane Cooper, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1917.
 Prof. William A. Cooper, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1901.
 Dr. Mario E. Cosenza, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (54 Vermilyea Ave.). 1908.
 Dr. Cornelia C. Coulter, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1912.
 * Prof. Frank H. Cowles, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1916.
 Prof. William L. Cowles, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1888.
 Prof. J. D. Craig, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1919.
 * Prof. John R. Crawford, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1912.
 Prof. Edmund D. Cressman, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (2076 S. St. Paul St.). 1914.
 Prof. Albert R. Crittenden, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (220 Twelfth St.). 1920.
 William Day Crockett, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. (226 S. Atherton St.). 1915.
 Prof. W. H. Crogman, Clark University, South Atlanta, Ga. 1898.
 * Prof. H. L. Crosby, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1909.
 William L. Cushing, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1888.
 Miss Jean V. N. Da Costa, 1529 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. John N. Daland, Milton College, Milton, Wis. 1920.
 Alfred Mitchell Dame, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1911.
 Dr. Fritz Sage Darrow, 218 East Ave., Rochester, N. Y. 1921.
 Prof. E. W. Davis, Maryville College, Maryville, Tenn. 1921.
 Prof. M. E. Davis, Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex. 1920.
 Prof. Lindley Richard Dean, 307 College Ave., Richmond, Ind. 1912.
 Miss Mildred Dean, 2111 O St., Washington, D. C. 1920.
 * Prof. Sidney N. Deane, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1912.
 Lieut. Frank M. Debatin, Montclair Academy, Montclair, N. J. 1915.
 Dr. Alice A. Deckman, 3236 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Roy J. Deferrari, Catholic University, Washington, D. C. 1915.

- Miss Augusta De Laguna, 518 24th St., Oakland, Cal. 1921.
- * Prof. Robert E. Dengler, Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa. 1918.
- Holmes Van Mater Dennis, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1921.
- † Prof. Samuel C. Derby, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. 1895.
- Dr. E. B. De Sauzé, Board of Education, Cleveland, O. 1920.
- Prof. Monroe E. Deutsch, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2805 Parker St.). 1904.
- Prof. Henry B. Dewing, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (12 Edgehill St.). 1909.
- * Prof. Norman W. DeWitt, Victoria College, Toronto, Can. 1907.
- Prof. Sherwood Owen Dickerman, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1902.
- Prof. Thomas Wyatt Dickson, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1915.
- Dr. George E. Dimock, Jr., Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (778 Orange St.). 1913.
- Miss Ellen MacKenzie Dodson, Mills College, Cal. (Box 15). 1921.
- Prof. James C. Dolley, McKendree College, Lebanon, Ill. 1920.
- Prof. Benjamin L. D'Ooge, State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich. 1895.
- Prof. James Walker Downer, Baylor University, Waco, Tex. 1915.
- Miss Juanita M. Downes, Cheltenham High School, Elkins Park, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. William Prentiss Drew, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 1907.
- Dr. Eleanor Shipley Duckett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (53 Crescent St.). 1914.
- Prof. Charles L. Durham, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1906.
- Prof. Donald Blythe Durham, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. Emily Helen Dutton, Tennessee College, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 1898.
- * Prof. Herman L. Ebeling, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. (329 Hawthorn Rd., Roland Park). 1892.
- Prof. William S. Ebersole, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Ia. 1893.
- Dr. George V. Edwards, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (1705 Montgomery Ave.). 1921.
- Prof. Katharine M. Edwards, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1893.
- * Prof. James C. Egbert, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1889.
- Prof. Wallace Stedman Elden, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (1734 Summit St.). 1900.
- Dr. Lulu G. Eldridge, Hathaway-Brown School, Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1920.
- Prof. W. A. Elliott, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1897.
- Willis A. Ellis, Lombard, Ill. 1921.
- Prof. Herbert C. Elmer, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1887.
- ‡ Judge L. A. Emery, 163 George St., Providence, R. I. 1920.
- Mrs. Ellinor T. B. Endicott, 404 W. 115th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. Robert B. English, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa. 1905.
- Prof. George Taylor Ettinger, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1896.
- Miss Catherine A. Everett, 1632 Latimer St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Dr. Arthur Fairbanks, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1886.
- † Died. ‡ Died August 26, 1920.

- Prof. Henry Rushton Fairclough, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1887.
- Prof. Fred L. Farley, College of the Pacific, San José, Cal. 1919.
- William W. Farnam, 335 Prospect St., New Haven, Conn. (Life member). 1921.
- Miss Elizabeth Faulkner, Faulkner School, 4746 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. (Life member). 1920.
- Pres. Thomas Fell, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1888.
- Frederick P. Fish, 84 State St., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. James Fulton Ferguson, 47 Orange St., New Haven, Conn. 1914.
- Prof. W. S. Ferguson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1899.
- Prof. Mervin G. Filler, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. 1905.
- Prof. George Converse Fiske, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (21 Mendota Ct.). 1900.
- * Prof. Edward Fitch, Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. 1890.
- Prof. Thomas FitzHugh, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. (Life member). 1902.
- Prof. Caroline R. Fletcher, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1906.
- Prof. Roy C. Flickinger, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (1629 Hinman Ave.). 1905.
- Miss Helen C. Flint, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1897.
- Herbert P. Flower, 1720 Delaware St., Berkeley, Cal. 1921.
- Dr. Francis H. Fobes, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1908.
- Prof. Charles H. Forbes, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass. (Life member). 1907.
- Dr. Emily Foulkrod, 1534 Harrison St., Frankford, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. Frank Hamilton Fowler, University of Arizona, University Station, Tucson, Ariz. 1893.
- Prof. Harold North Fowler, College for Women of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. (2033 Cornell Rd.). Life member. 1885.
- Miss Susan Fowler, The Brearley School, New York, N. Y. (60 E. 61st St.). 1904.
- Prof. William Sherwood Fox, Western University, London, Ont., Can. 1911.
- * Prof. Tenney Frank, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (Life member). 1906.
- Miss Ernestine P. Franklin, 800 N. Chestnut Ave., Williams Bridge, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. Nora Blanding Fraser, Staunton, Va. 1911.
- Dr. Walter H. Freeman, Worcester Academy, Worcester, Mass. 1908.
- Prof. A. L. Frothingham, Princeton, N. J. 1914.
- Prof. Charles Kelsey Gaines, St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y. 1890.
- Prof. John S. Galbraith, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1907.
- Alexander B. Galt, 2219 California St., Washington, D. C. 1917.
- Prof. Robert Max Garrett, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.
- Dr. Henry S. Gehman, South Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (5720 N. 6th St.). 1914.
- Prof. John Lawrence Gerig, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1909.
- Judge John Marshall Gest, 542 City Hall, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.

- Prof. A. F. Geyser, Campion College, Prairie du Chien, Wis. 1920.
 Miss Flora S. Gifford, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1921.
 Prin. Seth K. Gifford, Moses Brown School, Providence, R. I. 1891.
 * Prof. Basil L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1876.
 Dr. Walter H. Gillespie, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1908.
 * Harold Wright Gilmer, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1919.
 Ginn & Company, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. Meta Glass, Furnald Hall, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1916.
 Charles Bertie Gleason, High School, San José, Cal. (456 S. 2d St.). 1900.
 Clarence Willard Gleason, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1901.
 Prof. Julius Goebel, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1900.
 † Prof. Thomas D. Goodell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (35 Edgehill Rd.). 1883.
 Prof. Grace G. Goodrich, Ripon College, Ripon, Wis. 1921.
 Prof. Charles J. Goodwin, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. (18 E. Church St.). 1891.
 Prof. Florence Alden Gragg, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (234 Crescent St.). 1906.
 Prof. Roscoe Allan Grant, Jamaica High School, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y. 1902.
 Dr. William D. Gray, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1907.
 Theodore Francis Green, Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. 1920.
 Dr. William C. Greene, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (44 Shepard St.). 1915.
 * Prof. William Richard Grey, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C. 1920.
 Prof. Alfred Gudeman, Franz Josefstrasse 12, Munich, Germany. 1889.
 * Prof. Charles Burton Gulick, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
 * Prof. Richard Mott Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1907.
 Prof. Roy Kenneth Hack, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1910.
 * Prof. George D. Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1904.
 Miss E. Adelaide Hahn, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (640 Riverside Drive). 1917.
 Prof. Elizabeth Hazelton Haight, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1902.
 Prof. William Gardner Hale, Shippan Point, Stamford, Conn. 1882.
 Chancellor Frederic A. Hall, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (5846 Julian Ave.). 1886.
 Rev. Frank T. Hallett, Thornton, R. I. 1902.
 * Prof. H. A. Hamilton, Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y. 1895.
 Miss Alice B. Hammond, 130 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
 John Calvin Hanna, Department of Public Instruction, Springfield, Ill. 1896.
 Ralph W. Harbison, 1317 Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
 William Albert Harbison, 1317 Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Life member). 1921.
 * Prof. Caleb R. Harding, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C. 1919.
 † Died July 7, 1920.

- Prof. Albert Granger Harkness, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1896.
 Prof. Austin Morris Harmon, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (244 Lawrence St.). 1907.
 George McLean Harper, Jr., Princeton, N. J. 1921.
 Prof. Gustave Adolphus Harrer, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1914.
 Dr. Raymond D. Harriman, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. 1916.
 * Prof. Karl P. Harrington, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1892.
 Prof. W. A. Harris, Richmond College, Richmond, Va. 1895.
 Pres. Fairfax Harrison, Southern Railway, Washington, D. C. (Life member). 1914.
 Dr. Carl A. Harström, The Harström School, Norwalk, Conn. 1900.
 Prof. Walter Morris Hart, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2255 Piedmont Ave.). 1903.
 Dr. Floyd Clayton Harwood, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (492 Yale Station). 1919.
 Prof. Harold Ripley Hastings, 146 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md. 1905.
 * Prof. Adeline Belle Hawes, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1902.
 Dr. Edward Southworth Hawes, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, 7th Ave. and 92nd St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1888.
 Dr. H. M. Hays, Fenger High School, Chicago, Ill. 1920.
 Prof. Charles Baker Hedrick, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1913.
 Prof. Edward Hoch Heffner, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1917.
 Prof. William A. Heidel, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1900.
 Prof. F. B. R. Hellems, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1900.
 Prof. Clarence Nevin Heller, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. 1913.
 Prof. Otto Heller, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1896.
 * Prof. George L. Hendrickson, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1892.
 † Prof. John H. Hewitt, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1886.
 Prof. Joseph William Hewitt, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn. 1905.
 Director Bert Hodge Hill, American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. 1911.
 Prof. Victor D. Hill, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1920.
 * Prof. Robert H. Hiller, Wittenberg College, Springfield, O. (228 E. Madison Ave.). 1920.
 Prof. Gertrude M. Hirst, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.
 Prof. Helen Elisabeth Hoag, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1907.
 Archibald L. Hodges, Wadleigh High School, 114th St., near 7th Ave., New York, N. Y. 1899.
 Prof. Arthur Winfred Hodgman, Ohio State University, Columbus, O. (206 W. 10th Ave.). 1896.

† Died October 6, 1920.

- Prof. Charles Hoeing, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. 1899.
 Prof. Horace A. Hoffman, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. 1893.
 Prof. Richard T. Holbrook, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1921.
 Prof. Clara A. Holtzhausser, Oxford College, Oxford, O. 1917.
 Prof. W. D. Hooper, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1894.
 Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (299 Lawrence St.). 1883.
 Prof. Joseph Clark Hoppin, 310 Sears Bldg., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1900.
 * Prof. Robert C. Horn, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa. 1909.
 Prof. Albert A. Howard, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (12 Walker St.). 1892.
 Prof. Joseph Henry Howard, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak. (216 Pine St.). 1921.
 Prof. George Howe, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. 1914.
 Prof. Arthur W. Howes, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1918.
 * Prof. George Edwin Howes, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1896.
 Prof. Harry M. Hubbell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (268 Willow St.). 1911.
 Prof. Milton W. Humphreys, University, Va. 1871.
 Prof. Richard Wellington Husband, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1907.
 Dr. George B. Hussey, Newberry, S. C. 1887.
 Prof. Mark E. Hutchinson, Emory and Henry College, Emory, Va. 1921.
 Prin. Maurice Hutton, University College, Toronto, Can. 1908.
 Prof. Walter Woodburn Hyde, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1911.
 † Prof. J. W. D. Ingersoll, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (295 Crown St.). 1897.
 Prof. A. V. Williams Jackson, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1884.
 Prof. Carl Newell Jackson, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (25 Beck Hall). Life member. 1905.
 Prof. M. W. Jacobus, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.
 Prof. Hans C. G. von Jagemann, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (113 Walker St.). 1882.
 Prof. Samuel A. Jeffers, University Library, Columbia, Mo. 1909.
 * Prof. Allan Chester Johnson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1912.
 Dr. Edwin Lee Johnson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (3615 Westbrook Ave.). 1911.
 Prof. Harriet Dale Johnson, Denison University, Granville, O. 1920.
 Martin L. Johnson, 1934 Hamilton St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 William H. Johnson, 710 Franklin Ave., Columbus, O. 1895.
 Prof. Eva Johnston, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1902.
 * Prof. Richard O. Jolliffe, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont., Can. 1920.
 Prof. Horace L. Jones, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1908.
 Prof. Arthur Leslie Keith, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1914.
 Miss Ruth E. Keller, 568 S. Champion Ave., Columbus, O. 1921.
 † Died April, 1921.

- Prof. George Dwight Kellogg, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. 1897.
 Prof. Robert James Kellogg, Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla. 1912.
 Prof. Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1890.
 * Prof. Roland G. Kent, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (College Hall) Life member. 1903.
 J. A. Kerns, Whitman College, Walla Walla, Wash. 1921.
 Prof. David Martin Key, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss. 1917.
 Dr. Clinton Walker Keyes, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (404 W. 115th St.). 1914.
 Prof. David R. Keys, University College, Toronto, Can. 1908.
 Prof. William E. Kirk, Willamette University, Salem, Ore. (1450 State St.). 1920.
 Prof. William Hamilton Kirk, Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. 1898.
 Prof. John C. Kirtland, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1895.
 Prof. Robert Christian Kissling, Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, Cape Girardeau, Mo. 1920.
 Prof. George Lyman Kittredge, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (8 Hiliard St.). 1884.
 Prof. James A. Kleist, St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, O. 1920.
 Prof. Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (1737 Sedgwick Ave.). 1892.
 Prof. Fred A. Knapp, Bates College, Lewiston, Me. 1920.
 † Charles S. Knox, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. 1889.
 Miss Anna Krause, University of California, Southern Branch, Los Angeles, Cal. (753 S. Kingsley Drive). 1921.
 Prof. Raymond Henry Lacey, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. 1915.
 * Prof. Gordon J. Laing, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1907.
 Prof. A. G. Laird, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (130 Prospect Ave.). Life member. 1890.
 Dr. George A. Land, Short Hills School, Short Hills, N. J. 1914.
 * Prof. Charles R. Lanman, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (9 Farrar St.). 1877.
 Lewis H. Lapham, 17 Battery Pl., New York, N. Y. 1880.
 * Prof. Helen Hull Law, Meredith College, Raleigh, N. C. 1920.
 Dr. Arthur G. Leacock, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1899.
 Prof. Emory B. Lease, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. (889 St. Nicholas Ave.). 1895.
 Prof. David Russell Lee, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. (505 Main Ave., W.). 1907.
 Miss Mary S. Lee, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Earnest Linwood Lehman, University of Virginia, University, Va. 1919.
 Prof. Winfred G. Leutner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, O. 1905.
 Miss Lotta B. Liebmann, 11721 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O. 1920.
 † Died August 16, 1920.

- Prof. Ivan M. Linforth, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2233 Eunice St.). 1903.
- * Prof. Herbert C. Lipscomb, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va. 1909.
- Dr. Henry Wheatland Litchfield, Pembroke, Mass. 1912.
- Prof. Charles Edgar Little, Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn. 1902.
- * Prof. Dean P. Lockwood, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1909.
- Prof. Gonzalez Lodge, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
- Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Nahant, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
- James Loeb, 8 Maria Josefastrasse, Munich, Germany. 1913.
- * Prof. John Oscar Lofberg, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1919.
- * Prof. O. F. Long, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1900.
- Prof. Christopher Longest, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1913.
- * Prof. Louis E. Lord, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O. 1910.
- Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, O. 1920.
- Elford Floyd Lounsbury, Tilton Seminary, Tilton, N. H. 1920.
- Headmaster D. O. S. Lowell, Roxbury Latin School, Boston, Mass. 1894.
- Prof. John L. Lowes, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1916.
- Rev. William Ludwig, Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y. 1921.
- * Miss Katharine Lummis, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va. 1920.
- Dr. F. B. Lund, 257 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
- Dr. Elizabeth Perkins Lyders (Mrs.), 2429 Green St., San Francisco, Cal. 1904.
- Miss Caroline Vinia Lynch, 217 Norfolk St., Dorchester Centre, Boston, Mass. 1914.
- * Dr. Eugene S. McCartney, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1920.
- Prof. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1890.
- Prof. Walton Brooks McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (College Hall). 1901.
- Prof. J. H. McDaniels, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1871.
- Miss Cecelia Baldwin McElroy, 668 Irving Park Bd., Chicago, Ill. (Life member) 1914.
- Prof. Mary B. McElwain, Gillett House, Northampton, Mass. 1908.
- Dr. Charles W. Macfarlane, Ritz-Carlton Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa. 1914.
- Mrs. Ida Kruse McFarlane, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.
- Mrs. Isabella T. Machan, 854 W. Williams St., Decatur, Ill. 1921.
- Pres. A. St. Clair Mackenzie, 437 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1901.
- Miss Harriett E. McKinstry, Lake Erie College, Painesville, O. 1881.
- Dr. Charlotte F. McLean, Schuylkill Seminary, Reading, Pa. 1906.
- Pres. George E. MacLean, 50 Russell Square, London, W. C., 1, England. 1891.
- * Prof. James Sugars McLemore, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1912.
- Dr. Robert Cecil MacMahon, 78 W. 55th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. Grace Harriet Macurdy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1894.
- Dr. Anna Pearl MacVay, Wadleigh High School, New York, N. Y. 1918.

- * Prof. Ashton Waugh McWhorter, Hampden-Sidney College, Hampden-Sidney, Va. 1909.
 Robert L. McWhorter, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga. 1906.
 Prof. David Magie, Jr., Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (101 Library Pl.). 1901.
 Prof. Joseph S. Magnuson, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1920.
 Dr. Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1908.
 Dr. Herbert W. Magoun, 70 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1891.
 Prof. John M. Manly, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1896.
 * Dr. Clarence Augustus Manning, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1915.
 Prof. Richard Clarke Manning, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1905.
 Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
 Prof. Henry Martin, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1909.
 Miss Ellen F. Mason, Rhode Island Ave., Newport, R. I. 1885.
 Dr. Maurice W. Mather, 41 Dana St., Cambridge, Mass. 1894.
 Paul Mayo, University of Denver, Denver, Colo. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. Henrietta Josephine Meeteer, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa. 1920.
 Prof. Bruno Meinecke, Hope College, Holland, Mich. 1921.
 * Prof. Clarence W. Mendell, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1908.
 Prof. Frank Ivan Merchant, Iowa State Teachers' College, Cedar Falls, Ia. (1927 College St.). 1898.
 Prof. Elmer Truesdell Merrill, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1883.
 Prof. William A. Merrill, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2609 College Ave.). 1886.
 * Miss Ruth E. Messenger, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. 1920.
 * Prof. William Stuart Messer, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1915.
 Eugene Meyer, Jr., 820 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
 Dr. Truman Michelson, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. 1900.
 Prof. Charles Christopher Mierow, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. (216 E. Espanola St.). 1909.
 Herbert Edward Mierow, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 1914.
 Prof. Alfred William Milden, University of Mississippi, University, Miss. 1903.
 * Dr. A. Bertha Miller, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1915.
 * Prof. C. W. E. Miller, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
 Prof. Frank Justus Miller, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1920.
 * Prof. Theodore A. Miller, University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. (18 Sibley St.). 1915.
 Prof. Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1900.
 Knower Mills, Loomis Institute, Windsor, Conn. 1919.
 Prof. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa. (4326 Pine St.). 1921.
 * Prof. Clifford Herschel Moore, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (112 Brattle St.). Life member. 1889.
 Prof. Frank Gardner Moore, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1888.
 Prof. J. Leverett Moore, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1887.

- Prof. Paul G. Moorhead, 5742 Kenwood Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
 Paul E. More, 245 Nassau St., Princeton, N. J. 1896.
 Prof. Edward P. Morris, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (53 Edgehill Rd.). 1886.
 Nicholas Moseley, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1921.
 Prof. Lewis F. Mott, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1898.
 Prof. Omer Hillman Mott, Belmont Abbey, Belmont, N. C. 1921.
 Dr. Clyde Murley, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1920.
 Dr. E. J. Murphy, Division Superintendent of Schools, Lingayen, Pangasinan, P. I. 1900.
 Prof. Augustus Tabor Murray, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. (Box 112). 1887.
 Prof. E. W. Murray, 17 S. William St., New York, N. Y. 1907.
 Prof. John Scott Murray, Furman University, Greenville, S. C. (428 University Ridge). 1920.
 * Prof. Wilfred P. Mustard, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1892.
 Walter N. Myers, 32 Graduate House, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Dr. Royal C. Nemiah, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1919.
 Prof. K. P. R. Neville, Western University, London, Can. 1902.
 Prof. Charles B. Newcomer, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill. (835 W. College Ave.). Life member. 1900.
 Prof. Barker Newhall, Kenyon College, Gambier, O. 1891.
 Dr. Samuel Hart Newhall, 337 Orchard Lane, Highland Park, Ill. 1913.
 Dr. Edward Wilber Nichols, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S., Can. 1915.
 John D. Nicholson, Jacksonville, Tex. 1918.
 Dean Paul Nixon, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1907.
 Prof. Jonas O. Notestein, College of Wooster, Wooster, O. 1919.
 Prof. H. C. Nutting, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (Box 172). 1900.
 Prof. Irene Nye, Connecticut College for Women, New London, Conn. 1911.
 Prof. Caroline H. Ober, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.
 Dr. Margaret Brown O'Connor, 3702-a Page Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1916.
 Dr. Charles J. Ogden, 628 W. 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
 * Prof. C. H. Oldfather, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. 1919.
 Prof. William Abbott Oldfather, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. (804 W. Green St.). 1908.
 Prof. Samuel Grant Oliphant, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1907.
 Prof. W. H. Oxtoby, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Cal. 1914.
 Henry Gallup Paine, 1 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1919.
 Prof. Walter Hobart Palmer, Branford, Conn. 1914.
 Henry Spackman Pancoast, Spring Lane, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1914.
 Prof. Clarence Paschall, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2319½ Haste St.). 1903.
 Prof. James M. Paton, care of Morgan, Harjes & Co., 14 Place Vendôme, Paris, France. 1887.
 Thomas Patterson, 1712 Oliver Building, Pittsburg, Pa. (Life member). 1921.

Harry F. Payer, 538 East Ohio Gas Building, Cleveland, O. (Life member).
1921.

* Dr. Charles Peabody, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (197 Brattle St.).
1894.

Dr. Mary Bradford Peaks, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (Life member).
1905.

Dr. Joseph Pearl, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.

Prof. Arthur Stanley Pease, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 1906.

Prof. Tracy Peck, Boston Hotel, Rome, Italy. 1871.

Dr. William T. Peck, 48 Princeton Ave., Providence, R. I. 1920.

Prof. Daniel A. Penick, University of Texas, Austin, Tex. 1902.

George Wharton Pepper, Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.

* Prof. Charles W. Peppler, Trinity College, Durham, N. C. 1899.

Prof. Emma M. Perkins, College for Women of Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, O. 1892.

† Prof. Bernadotte Perrin, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (463 Whitney
Ave.). 1879.

Dr. Ben Edwin Perry, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. (8 School St.). 1920.

Prof. Edward D. Perry, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1882.

Prin. Lewis Perry, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1914.

Miss Marion V. Perry, 2532 S. Pershing St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

Prof. Walter Petersen, Westminster College, New Wilmington, Pa. 1913.

Prof. Torsten Petersson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2215 Marin
Ave.). 1905.

Prof. Clyde Pharr, Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn.
1912.

Dr. Aristides E. Phoutrides, Harvard Club, 27 W. 44th St., New York, N. Y.
1915.

* Miss Elizabeth D. Pierce, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1916.

‡ Prof. Samuel Ball Platner, Adelbert College of Western Reserve University,
Cleveland, O. (1961 Ford Drive). 1885.

George A. Plimpton, 61 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1916.

Alfred E. Porter, 674 Winthrop Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1921.

Prof. Chandler Rathfon Post, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.

Prof. Edwin Post, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1886.

Prof. Hubert McNeill Poteat, Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C. 1911.

Prof. Franklin H. Potter, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1898.

Henry Preble, 154 E. 91st St., New York, N. Y. 1882.

* Prof. William Kelly Prentice, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. (Life mem-
ber). 1895.

Prof. Henry W. Prescott, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1899.

* Dr. Keith Preston, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1914.

Prof. Clifton Price, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (23 Panoramic Way).
1899.

Dr. Lester M. Prindle, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt. (Life member).
1921.

† Died August 31, 1920.

‡ Died August 20, 1921.

- Dr. G. Payn Quackenbos, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Mrs. Eliza G. Radeke, 92 Prospect St., Providence, R. I. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Robert S. Radford, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn. (521 Walnut St.). 1900.
- Prof. Max Radin, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1732 Highland Pl.). 1921.
- * Prof. Edward Kennard Rand, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (106 Lake View Ave.). Life member. 1902.
- Prof. Charles B. Randolph, Clark College, Worcester, Mass. 1905.
- Prof. Edwin Moore Rankin, Claremont Inn, Claremont, Cal. 1905.
- Miss Ruth E. Razee, 137 Alden Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
- Prof. John W. Redd, Centre College, Danville, Ky. 1885.
- Prof. Katharine C. Reiley, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. Horatio M. Reynolds, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (85 Trumbull St.). 1884.
- Prof. Alexander H. Rice, Boston University, Boston, Mass. 1909.
- Prof. Leon J. Richardson, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2415 College Ave.). 1895.
- * Prof. Mary Lilius Richardson, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (36 Bedford Terrace). 1917.
- Prof. Ernest H. Riedel, Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La. 1908.
- Dr. Ernst Riess, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (221 W. 113th St., New York). 1895.
- Joaquin Palomo Rincon, Ava. Uruguay 45, Mexico, D. F., Mexico. 1912.
- Alfred L. Ripley, Andover, Mass. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Edmund Y. Robbins, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1895.
- Dr. Frank Eggleston Robbins, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1912.
- Harley F. Roberts, Tuft School, Watertown, Conn. 1921.
- Harold C. Roberts, Tulpehocken and Greene Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. Archibald Thomas Robertson, Southern Bapt. Theol. Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 1909.
- Prof. John Cunningham Robertson, 423 W. 22d St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
- * Prof. David M. Robinson, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. (Life member). 1905.
- Prof. Dwight Nelson Robinson, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O. 1911.
- Fletcher Nichols Robinson, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. 1909.
- Dr. James J. Robinson, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1902.
- Dr. Rodney Potter Robinson, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. 1920.
- Prof. Joseph C. Rockwell, Municipal University of Akron, Akron, O. 1896.
- Miss Dorothy M. Roehm, 3319 Hogarth Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1921.
- Robert Samuel Rogers, Madison, N. J. (Life member). 1921.
- * Prof. John Carew Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
- Dean Florence K. Root, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1919.
- Miss Mabel V. Root, Catskill, N. Y. 1920.

- Ruskin R. Rosborough, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (40 Graduate House). 1920.
- Prof. Clarence F. Ross, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. 1902.
- Martin L. Rouse, 25 Westdown Rd., Catford, S. E. 6, London, England. 1908.
- Prof. A. M. Rovelstad, Luther College, Decorah, Ia. 1921.
- Prof. William T. Rowland, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1919.
- Prof. August Rupp, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y. 1902.
- Prof. P. W. Russell, Biddle University, Charlotte, N. C. 1920.
- Thomas De Coursey Ruth, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C. 1914.
- Prof. Frances E. Sabin, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. 1920.
- Prof. Julius Sachs, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (The Belmont, 86th St. and Broadway). 1875.
- * Prof. Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (3138 Avalon St.). 1912.
- * Prof. Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. (521 Thompson St.). 1899.
- Miss Edith Sanford, 1233 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn. 1921.
- Prof. Myron R. Sanford, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1894.
- Henry B. Sargent, 247 Church St., New Haven, Conn. (Life member). 1921.
- Lt. Col. Winthrop Sargent, Jr., Haverford, Pa. 1909.
- * Prof. Catharine Saunders, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. (Life member). 1900.
- John Alexander Sawhill, Graduate College, Princeton, N. J. 1921.
- * Pres. W. S. Scarborough, Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, O. 1882.
- Prof. Felix E. Schelling, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. (4107 Pine St.). 1921.
- Prof. Hugo Karl Schilling, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2316 Le Conte Ave.). 1920.
- Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. D. T. Schoonover, Marietta College, Marietta, O. 1912.
- Prof. Robert Maxwell Scoon, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1914.
- Dr. Charles P. G. Scott, 49 Arthur St., Yonkers, N. Y. 1880.
- Harry F. Scott, Ohio University, Athens, O. 1921.
- Prof. John Adams Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. (1958 Sheridan Rd.). 1898.
- * Prof. Henry S. Scribner, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. (Life member). 1889.
- Prof. Helen M. Searles, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1893.
- Miss Laura Seguire, West Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Dr. Lewis L. Sell, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (240 W. 122d St.). 1916.
- * Prof. William Tunstall Semple, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O. (315 Pike St.). 1910.
- Prof. Joachim Henry Senger, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1321 Bay View Pl.). 1900.

- * Dr. T. Leslie Shear, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (211 N. Broadway, Yonkers). 1906.
- Prof. Edward S. Sheldon, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (39 Kirkland St.). 1881.
- Dr. Henry V. Shelley, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 1919.
- C. Sidney Shepard, New Haven, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Charles L. Sherman, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, O. (125 N. Sandusky St.). 1921.
- Prof. L. R. Shero, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y. 1921.
- * Dr. Emily L. Shields, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (36 Bedford Ter.). 1909.
- Prof. F. W. Shipley, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1900.
- Prof. Paul Shorey, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
- Prof. Grant Showerman, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (410 N. Butler St.). 1900.
- Prof. Thomas K. Sidey, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1914.
- Prof. E. G. Sihler, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1876.
- Pres. Kenneth C. M. Sills, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1906.
- Miss Adelaide Douglas Simpson, Sherman Square Hotel, New York, N. Y. 1919.
- * Prof. Moses Stephen Slaughter, 633 Francis St., Madison, Wis. (Life member). 1887.
- William Sloane, 689 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Charles Forster Smith, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis. (1715 Kendall Ave.). 1883.
- Charles H. Smith, Morristown School, Morristown, N. J. 1919.
- * Prof. Charles S. Smith, George Washington University, Washington, D. C. 1895.
- Prof. Harry de Forest Smith, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. 1899.
- Prof. Kendall Kerfoot Smith, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1910.
- Prof. Lillian S. Smith, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga. 1919.
- Dr. R. Morris Smith, Wittenberg Academy, Springfield, O. (280 W. Cecil St.). 1920.
- Prof. Herbert Weir Smyth, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. (15 Elmwood Ave.). Life member. 1886.
- Prof. Thomas Henry Sonnedecker, Heidelberg University, Tiffin, O. 1919.
- Prof. W. G. Spencer, Franklin College, Franklin, Ind. 1921.
- Prof. Martin Sprengling, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1916.
- Prof. Evelyn Spring, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass. 1917.
- Dr. Sidney G. Stacey, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. (177 Woodruff Ave.). 1901.
- Prof. R. B. Steele, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. (101 24th Ave. S.). 1893.
- Prof. Charles P. Steinmetz, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. (Life member). 1921.
- Prof. Rufus T. Stephenson, De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind. 1910.

- Prof. James Sterenberg, Knox College, Galesburg, Ill. 1910.
 Prof. Manson A. Stewart, Yankton College, Yankton, S. Dak. 1909.
 Prof. Francis H. Stoddard, 22 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1890.
 Prof. Alvin H. M. Stonecipher, Indiana Central University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1914.
 Prof. S. E. Stout, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. 1915.
 Prof. Frederick Eugene Stratton, Fargo College, Fargo, N. Dak. 1919.
 Dr. Robert P. Strickler, Kingwood, W. Va. 1911.
 Prof. Donald Clive Stuart, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.
 * Prof. Duane Reed Stuart, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1901.
 Mrs. Anne B. B. Sturgis, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1920.
 * Dr. Edgar Howard Sturtevant, 28 Myrtle Ave., Edgewater, N. J. 1901.
 * Dr. Mary Hamilton Swindler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1912.
 Miss Alice Post Tabor, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (1421 Hawthorne Ter.). 1921.
 * Prof. Rollin Harvelle Tanner, Denison University, Granville, O. (Box 485). Life member. 1911.
 Prof. Helen H. Tanzer, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. (Life member). 1910.
 † Prof. Frank B. Tarbell, Pomfret, Conn. 1882.
 Prof. John S. P. Tatlock, Leland Stanford Jr. University, Stanford University, Cal. 1915.
 * Prof. Eugene Tavenner, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. (McMillan Hall). 1912.
 Prof. Archer Taylor, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1920.
 Prof. John W. Taylor, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manit., Can. 1919.
 * Prof. Lily Ross Taylor, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1912.
 Prof. Susan D. Tew, Sophie Newcomb Memorial College, Tulane University, New Orleans, La. 1919.
 * Prof. Ida Carleton Thallon, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1915.
 Boyce A. Thomas, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
 Prof. Clara Louise Thompson, Shorter College, Rome, Ga. 1920.
 Dean David Thomson, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash. 1902.
 Prof. George R. Throop, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. 1907.
 Dr. Charles H. Thurber, 15 Ashburton Pl., Boston, Mass. 1901.
 Miss Margaret Titchener, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1920.
 Prof. Henry A. Todd, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1887.
 Prof. Herbert Cushing Tolman, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1889.
 Miss Lena B. Tomson, Milwaukee, Exeter Downer College, Milwaukee Wis. 1921.
 Prof. Catherine Torrance, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga. 1920.
 Prof. J. A. Tufts, Phillips Academy, N. H. 1898.
 Miss Elizabeth McJimsey Tyng, Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (430 W. 119th St., New York). 1916.
 * Prof. B. L. Ullman, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1910.
 Prof. Harry Brown Van Deventer, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1907.

† Died December 4, 1920.

- Prof. Justin Loomis Van Gundy, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill. 1920.
 Prof. Henry Bartlett Van Hoesen, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1909.
 * Prof. La Rue Van Hook, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1905.
 Addison Van Name, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. (121 High St.). 1869.
 Miss Susan E. Van Wert, Hunter High School, New York, N. Y. (316 W. 112th St.). 1914.
 Prof. Agnes Carr Vaughan, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y. 1917.
 Prof. N. P. Vlachos, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
 Prof. Frank Vogel, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass. 1904.
 J. Homer Wade, 3903 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1921.
 Dr. Anthony Pelzer Wagener, Roanoke College, Salem, Va. 1911.
 Prof. W. H. Wait, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1893.
 Miss Mary Violet Waite, Dongan Hall, Dongan Hills, Staten Island, N. Y. 1908.
 Prof. Margaret C. Waites, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1910.
 Dr. John W. H. Walden, 7 Irving Terrace, Cambridge, Mass. 1889.
 G. Byron Waldrop, Westminster School, Simsbury, Conn. 1921.
 Prof. Arthur Tappan Walker, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan. 1895.
 * Prof. Alice Walton, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1894.
 Prof. William D. Ward, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal. 1912.
 James R. Ware, 1709 Fillmore St., Camden, N. J. 1921.
 Dr. Edwin G. Warner, Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y. (56 Montgomery Pl.). 1897.
 Andrew McCorrie Warren, 225 Winthrop St., Taunton, Mass. 1892.
 Miss Henrietta M. Washburn, 317 S. 11th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. William E. Waters, New York University, University Heights, N. Y. 1885.
 Prof. John C. Watson, 6216 Wayne Ave., Edgewater Station, Chicago, Ill. 1902.
 Prof. Robert Henning Webb, University of Virginia, University, Va. 1909.
 Prof. Hermann J. Weber, Berkeley, Cal. (1811 La Loma Ave.). 1913.
 * Prof. Shirley H. Weber, 106 Broadmead, Princeton, N. J. 1914.
 Dr. Helen L. Webster, National Cathedral School, Washington, D. C. 1890.
 Prof. Raymond Weeks, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1902.
 Dr. Herbert T. Weiskotten, 47 Beechwood Rd., Summit, N. J. 1919.
 Prof. Charles Heald Weller, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia. 1903.
 Louis C. West, 706 Citizens Building, Cleveland, O. (Life member). 1921.
 Prof. J. H. Westcott, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1891.
 Prof. Arthur Harold Weston, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis. (619 Washington St.). 1915.
 Prof. Monroe Nichols Wetmore, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1906.
 * Prof. Arthur Leslie Wheeler, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. (221 Roberts Rd.). 1899.
 Pres. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (2425 Ridge Rd.). 1879.
 Benjamin Webb Wheeler, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. 1920.

- * Prof. George Meason Whicher, Hunter College, New York, N. Y. 1891.
 Dr. Andrew C. White, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. (424 Dryden Rd.).
 1886.
 Howell North White, Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn. 1921.
 * Prof. John B. White, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md. 1920.
 Prof. Raymond H. White, Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt. 1911.
 Philip B. Whitehead, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1920.
 Miss Mabel K. Whiteside, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va.
 1906.
 Prof. Edward A. Wicher, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo,
 Cal. 1906.
 Dr. Alfred Reynolds Wightman, Phillips Academy, Exeter, N. H. (84 Front St.).
 1920.
 * Prof. Henry D. Wild, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1898.
 Prof. Eliza G. Wilkins, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo. 1917.
 Charles Richards Williams, Benedict House, Princeton, N. J. 1887.
 Prof. Edward Thomas Williams, University of California, Berkeley, Cal. (453
 Wheeler Hall). 1919.
 Prof. Mary G. Williams, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1899.
 E. R. B. Willis, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1914.
 * Dr. Gwendolen B. Willis, Bryn Mawr School, Baltimore, Md. 1906.
 Harold R. Willoughby, 130 South Divinity Hall, Chicago, Ill. 1915.
 Dr. Pearl Cleveland Wilson, Miss Chandor's School, New York, N. Y. (65 Morn-
 ingside Ave.). 1919.
 Prof. William Jerome Wilson, State Normal School, Cheney, Wash. 1918.
 * Prof. Herbert Wing, Jr., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. (429 W. South St.).
 1915.
 Prof. John Garrett Winter, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1906.
 Prof. Boyd Ashby Wise, Stephens City, Va. 1909.
 Prof. William Dudley Woodhead, University of Toronto, Toronto, Can. 1920.
 * Prof. Willis Patten Woodman, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1901.
 Prof. Frank E. Woodruff, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me. 1887.
 * Prof. F. Warren Wright, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. 1910.
 Dr. Horace Wetherill Wright, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1918.
 Dr. William Frank Wyatt, 120 Packard Ave., Tufts College, 57, Mass. 1915.
 Prof. Herbert H. Yeames, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y. 1906.
 Prof. Clarence H. Young, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. (312 W. 88th
 St.). 1890.
 Dr. Charles Hamline Zimmerman, 155 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1920.

Members in the above list,	745
Members not in the above list :	
From the Association of the Pacific Coast,	11
Elected after going to press,	29
Total,	<hr/> 785

CONSTITUTION
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION¹

ARTICLE I. — NAME AND OBJECT

1. This Society shall be known as "The American Philological Association."
2. Its object shall be the advancement and diffusion of philological knowledge.

ARTICLE II. — OFFICERS

1. The officers shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Secretary and Curator, and a Treasurer.
2. There shall be an Executive Committee of ten, composed of the above officers and five other members of the Association.
3. All the above officers shall be elected at the last session of each annual meeting.
4. An Assistant Secretary, and an Assistant Treasurer, may be elected at the first session of each annual meeting, on the nomination of the Secretary and the Treasurer respectively.

ARTICLE III. — MEETINGS

1. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in the city of New York, or at such other place as at a preceding annual meeting shall be determined upon.
2. At the annual meeting, the Executive Committee shall present an annual report of the progress of the Association.
3. The general arrangements of the proceedings of the annual meeting shall be directed by the Executive Committee.
4. Special meetings may be held at the call of the Executive Committee, when and where they may decide.

ARTICLE IV. — MEMBERS

1. Any lover of philological studies may become a member of the Association by a vote of the Executive Committee and the payment of five dollars as initiation fee, which initiation fee shall be considered the first regular annual fee.

¹ As amended December 28, 1907.

2. There shall be an annual fee of three dollars from each member, failure in payment of which for two years shall *ipso facto* cause the membership to cease.

3. Any person may become a life member of the Association by the payment of fifty dollars to its treasury, and by vote of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE V. — SUNDRIES

1. All papers intended to be read before the Association must be submitted to the Executive Committee before reading, and their decision regarding such papers shall be final.

2. Publications of the Association, of whatever kind, shall be made only under the authorization of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE VI. — AMENDMENTS

Amendments to this Constitution may be made by a vote of two-thirds of those present at any regular meeting subsequent to that in which they have been proposed.

COMMITTEES AND BUSINESS MATTERS

1. **NOMINATING COMMITTEE**, established July 8, 1903 (XXXIV, xix, xlv). One member retires each year after five years of service, and is replaced by a successor named by the President of the Association. The present membership of the Committee is as follows: —

Professor Edward Capps.
Professor John A. Scott.
Professor Carl D. Buck.
Professor Frank G. Moore.
Professor Frank Frost Abbott.

2. **COMMITTEE ON GRAMMATICAL NOMENCLATURE** (representing the Association on the Joint Committee), appointed in 1911 (XLII, xii), and continued at the subsequent meetings: —

Professor John C. Kirtland.
† Professor Benjamin L. Bowen.
Professor Hermann Collitz.
Professor Walter Miller.
Dr. Sidney G. Stacey.

3. **COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL MEETINGS**, appointed December, 1909 (XL, xiv), and continued since: —

Professor Elmer Truesdell Merrill.
Professor Edward P. Morris.
Professor Edward Kennard Rand.

4. **PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE PACIFIC COAST**. The present terms of affiliation between this Association and the American Philological Association are defined in the Articles of Agreement adopted by the two Associations in December, 1916 (XLVII, xi f.), and November, 1917 (XLVIII, xiv), respectively.

5. **SALARY OF THE SECRETARY AND TREASURER**. In December, 1916, the Association fixed the salary of the Secretary and Treasurer at \$350, to include any outlay for clerical assistance (XLVII, xi).

6. **PUBLICATION**. By vote of the Association (December, 1919), the publication of the annual volume was put in charge of the Secretary (I, xi).

7. **VETERAN MEMBERS**. On December 29, 1911, the Executive Committee voted that it be the practice of the Committee to relieve from the payment of further dues members of thirty-five years standing, who have reached the age of sixty-five.

† Died.

8. LIFE MEMBERSHIPS. On December 31, 1914, it was voted by the Association that the Treasurer be instructed to fund all sums received for life memberships (XLV, xiv).

9. LAPSE OF MEMBERSHIP. On December 29, 1917, by vote of the Association, Art. iv, Sec. 3 of the Constitution, long neglected, was again put in force. Membership therefore ceases automatically after failure in the payment of the annual fee for two years (XLVIII, x).

10. By vote of the Association (December 28, 1918), no member is entitled to receive the annual volume unless he has paid the dues for the year for which the volume is issued (XLIX, vii).

11. AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES. On December 31, 1919, the Association declared its adherence to the American Council of Learned Societies, a member of the Union Académique International (L, ix-x). The delegates of the Association to the Council are Professors Frank G. Moore and John C. Rolfe.

12. ENDOWMENT COMMITTEE, established December 31, 1919 (L, xi): —

Fairfax Harrison, <i>Chairman</i> .	Principal Maurice Hutton.
G. A. Plimpton, <i>Treasurer</i> .	Professor John M. Manly.
Professor Clarence P. Bill, <i>Secretary</i> .	Professor Clifford H. Moore.
† Professor Charles E. Bennett.	Professor Frank G. Moore.
Dr. Arthur Fairbanks.	Dr. Paul Elmer More.
Professor B. L. Gildersleeve.	Professor John C. Rolfe.
Professor G. L. Hendrickson.	Professor Paul Shorey.
Professor Herbert Weir Smyth.	

13. COMMITTEE ON AN INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE, appointed December 30, 1920 (LI, xii): —

Professor W. A. Oldfather.	Professor Dean P. Lockwood.
Professor Carl D. Buck.	Professor Clarence W. Mendell.
Professor Roland G. Kent.	Professor H. P. Nutting.
Professor L. J. Paetow.	

14. The Association accepted an invitation from the Classical Association of Great Britain to take part in an Anglo-American General Meeting in Cambridge, England, August 2-5, 1921 (LI, xi).

† Died May 2, 1921.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

THE annually published *Proceedings* of the American Philological Association contain, in their present form, the programme and minutes of the annual meeting, brief abstracts of papers read, a record of the publications of members of the Association, and lists of its officers and members.

The annually published *Transactions* give the full text of such articles as the Executive Committee decides to publish. The *Proceedings* are bound with them.

For the contents of Volumes I-XXXIV inclusive, see Volume XXXIV, pp. cxliii ff.; for XXXV-XLVII, Volume XLVII, pp. lxxxviii ff. The contents of Volumes XLVIII-L are as follows:

1917 — Volume XLVIII

- Stuart, D. R.: Petrarch's indebtedness to the *libellus* of Catullus.
Moore, C. H.: The decay of nationalism under the Roman Empire.
Hewitt, J. W.: Some aspects of the treatment of ingratitude in Greek and English literature.
Sturtevant, E. H.: *Tenuis* and *media*.
Bradley, C. B.: The history of the Sukhōthai letters.
Carnoy, A. J.: The predicating sentence.
Bassett, S. E.: The hephthemimeral caesura in Greek hexameter poetry.
Ullman, B. L.: Horace on the nature of satire.
Lanman, C. R.: Hindu ascetics and their powers.
Proceedings of the forty-ninth annual meeting, Philadelphia, Pa., 1917.
Proceedings of the nineteenth annual meeting of the Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1917.

1918 — Volume XLIX

- Pease, A. S.: On the authenticity of the *Hercules Oetaeus*.
Flickinger, R. C.: The accusative of exclamation: Lucretius to Ovid.
Bassett, S. E.: The suitors of Penelope.
Bourne, Ella: Augustus as a letter-writer.
Tavener, Eugene: The Roman farmer and the moon.
Steele, R. B.: The similes in Latin epic poetry.
Carnoy, A. J.: The real nature of dissimulation.
Lockwood, D. P.: Two thousand years of Latin translation from the Greek.
Brewster, E. H.: The synthesis of the Romans.

- Hadzsits, G. D.: Lucretius as a student of Roman religion.
 Proceedings of the fiftieth annual meeting, New York, N. Y., 1918.
 Proceedings of the twentieth annual meeting of the Philological Association of
 the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1918.

1919 — Volume L (Semi-Centennial)

- Moore, F. G.: A history of the American Philological Association.
 Shorey, Paul: Fifty years of classical philology in America.
 Bloomfield, Maurice: Fifty years of comparative philology in America.
 Elmore, Jefferson: The Philological Association of the Pacific Coast.
 Kent, R. G.: The Latin language in the fourth century.
 Merrill, E. T.: The Church in the fourth century.
 Moore, C. H.: The pagan reaction in the late fourth century.
 Rolfe, J. C.: Claudian.
 Pease, A. S.: The attitude of Jerome toward pagan literature.
 Sage, E. T.: The publication of Martial's poems.
 Calhoun, G. M.: Oral and written pleading in Athenian courts.
 Proceedings of the fifty-first annual meeting, Pittsburgh, Pa., 1919.
 Proceedings of the twenty-first annual meeting of the Philological Association of
 the Pacific Coast, San Francisco, Cal., 1919.
 Indices to Volumes XLI–L.

The *Proceedings* of the American Philological Association are distributed gratis upon application to the Secretary until they are out of print.

Fifty separate copies of articles printed in the *Transactions* are given to the authors for distribution. Additional copies are furnished at cost.

The “*Transactions for*” any given year are not always published in that year. To avoid mistakes in ordering back volumes, please state — not the year of publication, but rather — the year *for* which the *Transactions* are desired, adding also the volume-number, according to the following table: —

The <i>Transactions</i> for 1869 and					The <i>Trans.</i> for 1880 form Vol. XI				
1870 form Vol. I					“	“	1881	“	“ XII
The <i>Trans.</i> for	1871	“	“	II	“	“	1882	“	“ XIII
“	“	1872	“	“ III	“	“	1883	“	“ XIV
“	“	1873	“	“ IV	“	“	1884	“	“ XV
“	“	1874	“	“ V	“	“	1885	“	“ XVI
“	“	1875	“	“ VI	“	“	1886	“	“ XVII
“	“	1876	“	“ VII	“	“	1887	“	“ XVIII
“	“	1877	“	“ VIII	“	“	1888	“	“ XIX
“	“	1878	“	“ IX	“	“	1889	“	“ XX
“	“	1879	“	“ X	“	“	1890	“	“ XXI

The <i>Trans.</i> for 1891 form Vol. XXII					The <i>Trans.</i> for 1906 form Vol. XXXVII						
"	"	1892	"	"	XXIII	"	"	1907	"	"	XXXVIII
"	"	1893	"	"	XXIV	"	"	1908	"	"	XXXIX
"	"	1894	"	"	XXV	"	"	1909	"	"	XL
"	"	1895	"	"	XXVI	"	"	1910	"	"	XLI
"	"	1896	"	"	XXVII	"	"	1911	"	"	XLII
"	"	1897	"	"	XXVIII	"	"	1912	"	"	XLIII
"	"	1898	"	"	XXIX	"	"	1913	"	"	XLIV
"	"	1899	"	"	XXX	"	"	1914	"	"	XLV
"	"	1900	"	"	XXXI	"	"	1915	"	"	XLVI
"	"	1901	"	"	XXXII	"	"	1916	"	"	XLVII
"	"	1902	"	"	XXXIII	"	"	1917	"	"	XLVIII
"	"	1903	"	"	XXXIV	"	"	1918	"	"	XLIX
"	"	1904	"	"	XXXV	"	"	1919	"	"	L
"	"	1905	"	"	XXXVI	"	"	1920	"	"	LI

The price of these volumes is \$2.00 apiece, except Volumes xv, xx, xxiii, xxxii, xxxvi, xl, xli, and xliii-xlix, for which \$2.50 is charged, and Volumes L and LI, the price of which is \$3.00. The first two volumes will not be sold separately. Volumes v, vi, and vii are out of print. A charge of fifty cents per copy is made for reprints of the indices to Volumes xxxi-xl; and seventy-five cents for the indices to Volumes xli-L.

Libraries may obtain bound copies of the annual volumes at fifty cents per volume in addition to the regular price.

Odd volumes will be bound by F. J. Barnard & Co., 105 Federal Street, Boston, at a price to be quoted upon application.

Orders for the publications of the Association should be sent to the Secretary, Professor Clarence P. Bill, Adelbert College, Cleveland, Ohio. For prices, see above (pp. lxx-lxxi).

120-3

